THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, B.D., Redhill Rectory, Havant,
to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. X JUNE, 1925 No. 60

EDITORIAL

A NICENE NUMBER

In various parts of the Christian world celebrations will be taking place this summer in thankful commemoration of the sixteenth centenary of the Council of Nicea; and we have decided to devote a large part of the present number to various aspects of that momentous event and of the issues which hung upon it. The Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Cambridge outlines the historical background of the Council, setting the figure of the great Constantine in the centre of the picture. Bishop Robertson, formerly of Exeter, a veteran student of the theology of the period, expounds the doctrinal issues of the Assembly, and shows how its pre-eminent work was "to make sure of the Divine Unity as the corner-stone of Christian belief." We are glad that he has enunciated this theme so clearly at the outset. We are apt to forget in our controversies with the kind of Modernism which found expression at the Girton Conference of 1921 that the question at issue is not simply one of Christology, but involves the whole Christian conception of God as transcendent and Tri-Une; and the decision at Nicea is still the sheet-anchor of this Faith.

And it is the Faith of the New Testament. Dr. Harris shows how little can be said to-day for the notion, once popular in critical circles, that the Nicene Creed represents the corruption of an original simple and primitive Gospel by unwarranted additions and accretions. On the contrary, all the essentials of the Faith which won and still holds the title of Catholic are already reverberant in the writings of St. Paul and his contemporaries. And they reverberate still. From Canada, where he is helping to train the future Ministry of the Canadian Church, Canon de Pauley sends an unsolicited article which we are glad

to include in this number; while the Bishop of London has kindly found time, in the midst of evangelistic work, to send us a characteristically human testimony to what the Creed has meant in his long and varied personal experience. There are other aspects of the great Council, it need hardly be said, which we wish it had been possible to add to those here dealt with. Athanasius, the dominating personality of the controversy, deserves an article to himself; and it would have been gratifying to have seen the development and discussion of the Nicene Christology in modern theology traced by some competent pen. But there is a sense in which this last at least is always with us; and it is hoped that what is here given may serve to recall how much we owe to the Fathers of the great Council for their work that day, and cause us to lift up our hearts with them, and with all who tread and have trodden in their path, to Him whom they confessed as Very God.

CONSTANTINE AND THE EMPIRE

I.—Constantine's Early Years.

When Constantius, who had been first Cæsar and then Augustus, died at York (July 25, 306), his son Constantine was hailed by the army as Augustus. Already he had seen much of the empire and was marked out for rule. His father, married to Theodora, step-daughter of Maximian, had been Cæsar since 293, ruling Gaul and Britain as he pleased and on his own lines. Constantine himself had been betrothed to Fausta, Maximian's daughter (396), and was thus entangled in the marriage alliances which were to knit together the Imperial College. His appointment as Cæsar had at that time been expected; he had lived at the court of Diocletian (293-305) at Nicomedia; he had visited Egypt along with that great imperial organizer; he had seen the persecution at Nicomedia. But when Galerius became Augustus, and he himself was passed over, Constantine fled from the court to join his father. Then when his army would have had him as Augustus Galerius gave him only the rank of Cæsar until, in 308, he became Augustus.

II.—Diocletian: Reforms and Persecution.

The reign of Diocletian (284-305) had been marked by his reorganization of the empire, often but wrongly ascribed to Constantine, and by the Great Persecution from 303 onwards.

The reorganization made permanent and systematic the centralization which had been long growing up. The imperial court, moved eastwards to Nicomedia, was its centre, and a vast army of graduated officials centring in it covered the empire. Centralization, before which all races in the empire became more equal, and absolutism, which raised the Emperor, making him more of an Oriental despot than a Roman successor of Augustus, went hand in hand. But the framework of machinery lacked a soul, and that reverence for the Emperor, which clothed him with new ceremonies and splendour, did not supply the want. A new unity was needed; the weight of imperial responsibility was heavy; the armies, strong on the frontiers and with interests of their own, were threatening. Diocletian's institution of an Imperial College—two Augusti, and under them two Cæsars, each of the four with his own territory—divided the work and the responsibility and prevented interruption by assassination. This system was on its trial until 323, with crises in 312, when Constantine defeated Maxentius at Saxa Rubra (October 28, 312) and so became ruler of the West; in 313, when Licinius defeated Maximin Daza (April 30, 313); and finally, in 323, when Constantine defeated Licinius at Chrysopolis (September, 323), and so became sole ruler.

III.—Problem of Religion.

Religion, and above all the Christian religion, was the problem of the day. The persecution (303-304) by Diocletian and Maximian, renewed by Galerius and his nephew Maximin Daza (305-311), had failed, in spite of its disgraceful cruelty, possibly because of it. The last act of Galerius (April, 311) had been to issue an edict of toleration, permitting even the Christians to worship. But when Galerius died, Maximin Daza not only relapsed into persecution, stimulated by arranged petitions, but attempted to give the decaying heathenism a constitution and an effectiveness equal to those of the Church, and modelled upon it. Maxentius at Rome and Maximin in the East had been allies, politically and religiously, against Constantine and Licinius, the former pair favouring paganism, the latter Christianity. The victory at Saxa Rubra was then followed by the Edict of Milan (March, 313), republished (June 13, 1313) by Licinius for the East, after his defeat of Maximin. Even the persecutor Maximin had seen the need for toleration; when he was thrown back by Licinius upon Syria and Egypt, where Christians were strong, he sent out an edict allowing anyone to follow his own religion in peace; even the hypocritical profession that the persecution had offended his

real benevolence could not hide the significance of the act. Christians, after their last dread agony, had won toleration, and it remained. How to treat the Christian Church had long been a problem for the emperors: Diocletian, Maximian, Galerius, and Maximin Daza had persecuted, but Constantius, in Gaul and Britain, had been friendly and tolerant; he was something of a monotheist and a more educated man, and even when he had to carry out the decrees of Diocletian and Maximian, had merely destroyed the churches without touching human bodies —the temples of God.

Thus Constantine had inherited a tolerant policy, which he himself was ready in other ways to adopt. Against their common heathen rivals Licinius had followed him, and if, when left face to face with Constantine alone, Licinius had drifted into harassing Christians (319), forbidding them at court, impeding their councils, forbidding women to worship along with men, and ordering them to worship not in cities, but in the country where the air was purer, he gained nothing by the change. Heathenism could give him no fresh strength; the discontent and ill-will of the Christians counted for much. Constantine, with his declared toleration and his growing favour to the Christian Church, knew better whence fresh strength and unity could be sought for an empire which needed both. The framework might be political, but the spirit was to be religious, a truth which the old cult of the empire had grasped. To the Church, as Tertullian and Origen had known long before, the victory was in the end to fall. The majesty of Constantine, and the impression of ecclesiastical power and unity seen at Nicæa, were to work together. It is easy—because of the sad years that followed the Great Council itself—to forget what the great Emperor did, for the empire and for the Church.

IV.—Constantine as Sole Ruler.

Such had been the path which had brought Constantine to an undivided empire. We may now turn to speak of the man himself. His father had been a tolerant ruler with no taste for persecution, and happily able to moderate it in the lands which he ruled. He himself had seen Christians in prosperity and in adversity; on his way to Egypt he had met the great Christian Bishop Eusebius of Cæsarea, afterwards to be his friend and biographer. Constantius had been an eclectic, and his greater son " seems to have begun where his father left off, as more or less monotheistic, and more or less friendly to the Christians; and all these things grew upon him." In his private life he was pure and humane, even if in Gaul he had followed

up his military success by cruel slaughter. Christian monotheism, Christian morality, he could well appreciate; Christian organization attracted the statesman just as Christian virtues attracted the man. These things appealed to him for reasons other than political. The persecuting emperors from Diocletian downwards had failed to crush Christianity. It was left for Constantine to become its friend, and thus bring new strength and new unity to the empire. He had made friends, too, with Hosius, the great statesman bishop of Spain, skilled, as the Council of Elvira had shown, in steering, by the help of Episcopacy and Councils, a growing Church through stormy times. And Hosius seems to have become the ecclesiastical adviser of Constantine. It is unfair, therefore, as well as needless, to regard him as one who turned to Christianity merely for its political use. He may not at first have understood thoroughly all that it implied. But even if the Labarum itself may have had some appeal to the worshippers of Mithras, so numerous in the army, and if for some years he held it wise to move with caution, his sympathy for Christianity and his knowledge of it grew. His celebrated vision from the sky belongs to his campaign against Maxentius; he himself told the story to Eusebius of Cæsarea, and there is no doubt that he thought he had beheld some such sign. From this time onwards, with some possible ambiguity, he appeared as a friend of Christianity. With some ambiguity, it may be allowed, for monotheism was in the air; Christians and worshippers of Mithras may have had some ideas and even symbols in common; interpretations might differ, but those historians or critics who ascribe to Constantine conscious duplicity do injustice to his greatness, his sincerity, and his appreciation, growing and to grow still more, of Christianity as a Faith, and of the Christian Church as a world-wide power. At his death-bed baptism (337)—and the long postponement should not be ascribed to any lack of belief—he said, "Let there be no ambiguity." He was a Christian Emperor from conviction as well as from political instinct, and the New Rome, which was to bear his name, was to be a Christian city from the start, unhampered as the Old Rome had been and was long to be by heathen traditions and worship.

V.—The Edict of Milan.

The Edict of Milan declared it "consonant to right reason that no man should be denied leave to attach himself to the rites of the Christians or to whatever other religion his mind may guide him." So to all men—to others as well as to Christians—was now granted the open and free exercise of their religion.

It befitted, so it was declared, a well-ordered State and tranquil times that each man, according to his choice, might worship the Divinity in the way he pleased. So Religion was to be no longer an affair for the State, but for each worshipper's conscience and himself.

But the Edict dealt also specially with Christianity, and here it tried to atone for the days of persecution and the harm they had wrought. The Church as a corporation was to have its confiscated property freely restored. Thus the Church was recognized as a society, and received justice, if as yet no favour. But that was soon to come. More and more Constantine showed favour to Christians; from 313 to 323, as he gained more power, successive laws gave Christian clergy the same immunity from municipal functions that pagan priests had enjoyed; the Canons of Elvira amply illustrate the dangers and the expense such duties had entailed. Enfranchisement of slaves was allowed in churches as formerly in temples. Sunday was placed on the same level as heathen festivals; public work was stayed, and the law-courts closed that day. Legacies to churches were permitted, and Constantine in his lifetime gave generous gifts. Great churches were built, and endowed at the public cost: at Rome, the Lateran, St. Peter, and St. Paul (outside the city), and St. Lawrence; at Antioch, Jerusalem, Bethlehem, and Constantinople, where an earlier St. Sophia preceded Justinian's greater church—all these places showed his favour and generosity to the Church. In the West he was free from 313 onwards to show his inclinations. This triumph over Licinius gave him the same freedom in the empire as a whole, and above all in his great New and Christian Rome.

VI.—Constantine and the Church.

Thus we see the great Emperor first removing the old shackles off the Church's body, and then adorning it with gifts and favour. He saw the Church as a widespread society, with a strength, a unity and a morality able to reinvigorate the empire. Provincial councils, not only in the East but also since St. Cyprian in the West, had shown its unity and coherence. Hosius, as was easy for a Spaniard, had learnt something of Cyprian's constitutional rule. But if the Church was to help the empire to a new unity, it must be one within itself. But here Donatism appeared as a disturbing force. Hence Constantine's somewhat unwilling, and in the end impatient, interference. To the bishops, and especially to those assembled at Arles, he wished to leave the settlement; he disliked the lawlessness and the persistence of the Donatists, and after the

Council he grew impatient with their continued appeal. He desired peace within the Church, and so Arles suggested Nicea. When what might have been a purely Egyptian difficulty grew, as Duchesne suggests, by the machinations of Eusebius of Nicomedia, into a trouble of imperial dimensions, a Council, on the imperial and not merely provincial scale, suggested itself. The Church at large must itself compose its differences, and the Emperor was more than ready to help.

Within the Church, districts and provinces had long had their Councils: a Christian empire could aim at something greater. In the smaller meetings bishops had borne witness to their local Christianity and legislated for constitutional needs. When more widely spread differences disturbed the Church as a whole, it was well that the bishops from all parts should bring together the testimony of all the local churches as to what was the Christianity they had received. This was the significance of the appeal to Baptismal creeds, for witness rather than for discussion. Under the patronage, and even more than the patronage, of the Emperor, the bishops met and decided as a world-wide Society. This was for the Faith. And on matters of working, such as the fixing of Easter, they also discussed and legislated as smaller Councils on a smaller scale had done before. Now they did it for all the churches of the empire. Thus as the Creed of Nicea stated the Faith of the whole Church, the Canons of Nicea became the basis of Canon Law for both East and West. The Church was free, and its organization covered the empire. Church and State were to work together, and a Christian emperor was to secure their peace. So Constantine brought into the Temple of Christ the old splendour of the Pax Romana. He began a new Age, and the part the great Emperor played can never be forgotten.

VII.—Eastern and Western Views of Constantine.

But East and West looked back to him in different ways. In the West, where Rome had been left without an emperor on its throne, smaller successors, and later on barbarian invaders, destroyed much of the edifice he had raised. His memory survived as the leper whom Pope Sylvester had baptized—the Constantine of the Donation. But even so the Creed which had issued from Nicea, and the episcopate which he had taught its place and strength, remained as the foundation of the Christian Middle Ages. St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, Leo the Great, Innocent I., and Gregory the Great carried on his work. But to the East the founder of the New Rome was even more: the first of long lines of Christian emperors; if it regarded emperors

with an almost overweening respect it was because of the empire's Christian character. They sat in the seat of the great Emperor, who had joined together Church and State, the throne of Constantine, the great Ἰσαπόστολος of Christianity and its civilization.

NOTE ON THE LITERATURE.

H. M. Gwatkin, chap. i. (on Constantine) in *Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. i., 1911, is masterly. It is accompanied by a Bibliography of Sources (among which Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, is the chief) and later works. The same writer's *Arian Controversy* (in *Epochs of Church History*) is a brilliant short sketch. Gibbon should still be read, and with it Bury's note in his edition (vol. ii., p. 565); the judgment there given that Constantine's support of Christianity was not a mere political move, must be accepted. L. Duchesne, *Early History of the Church*, London, 1912 (translated from *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, vol. ii., Paris, 1910). W. Bright, *Church of the Fathers*, vol. i., London, 1903. B. J. Kidd, *A History of the Church to* 461, vol. ii., Oxford, 1922 (with a good, short account of Constantine's legislation). P. Batiffol, *La Paix Constantinienne*, Paris, 1914 (with Excursus A (*Sol Invictus*) and B (*Summus Deus, Le monothéisme dans la paganisme*)), is specially useful. See also L. Bréhier et P. Batiffol, *Les Survivances du culte impérial romain*, Paris, 1920 (illustrating the survival of relics from the cult of the emperors in the Byzantine Empire, ceremonies, and to a less extent ideas, being transformed and kept). There is much of use in the new French translation of Hefele's *History of Councils*, edited and much enriched by Dom H. Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, vol. i., pt. 1, Paris, 1907. For the churches built at Rome see Hartmann Grisar, *History of Rome and the Popes in the Middle Ages*, vol. i., London, 1911; also *Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. i., chap. xxi. (W. Lethaby), p. 609 *seq.* For Donatism, P. Monceaux, *Histoire Littéraire de l'Afrique Chrétienne*, vol. iv., Paris, 1912. For the Councils and Canon Law see *Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. i., chap. vi. (C. H. Turner), p. 176 *seq.*

J. P. WHITNEY.

THE COUNCIL OF NICEA*

THE purpose of these pages is to tell the reader what the Council of Nicea really did and what are its claims on the allegiance of Christians to day.

Briefly, the work of the Council was to make sure of the Divine Unity as the corner-stone of Christian belief. The magnitude of the achievement was due to its difficulty. Christians believed, as the sequel showed, with all their hearts, in the unity of God, but they did not believe in a bare unity in the Jewish

* Further information may be found in the following books: Newman, *Arians;* Gwatkin, *Arian Controversy* and *Studies of Arianism;* Robertson, *Prolegomena to Athanasius* (vol. iv. of Nicene and Post-Nicene Library).

fashion. They believed in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, but they rejected a Trinity of Gods. There was to them, as to us, not three Gods but one God. The difficult question turned on the person of Christ. All believed that Christ was God and to be worshipped, but if Christ is God it must, so it seemed, follow that God is Christ, and the Trinity of Persons thus involved the paradox that God, even the Father, suffered and was crucified. This solution, impossible as it seems to us, found devoted adherents and was not abandoned without a struggle.

I.—Preliminary.

We find it upheld in Rome by Sabellius, later on at Antioch with a difference by Paul of Samosata, and in a peculiar form by Marcellus of Ancyra, of whom later on. We may in fact say that two opposite dangers impressed Christian thought in the pre-Nicene age. The Western Church was specially sensitive to the risk of dividing the substance, while the Greeks were specially horrified at the tendency to confound the Persons in the Godhead. The problem solved by Nicea was to find a formula which should steer clear of either peril. The formula in question (the Homousion) was successfully inserted in the Creed by Western influence with the support of Alexandria and a few other Eastern Churches. The difficulty which delayed for forty years its final acceptance by the Churches lay mainly in the widespread fear of its lurking tendency to Sabellianism.

But this is to anticipate. Behind what took place at Nicea lies a whole age of explanation and controversy more or less inconclusive, which lies outside the limits of the present paper.

II.—Early Doctrinal Difficulties.

The discussions which took place all over Christendom were inevitable. We must remember that difficulties were not sought, but came of themselves. The early Christians were not a society of theologians. By one impulse or conviction they were at once monotheists and worshippers of Christ. It needed a Sabellius to rouse the Church to any sense of paradox. In vain did his supporter, Praxeas, urge the Christians of Rome to "crucify the Father."

Meanwhile, the heathen world was criticizing the Christians, and imputed to them not merely civil and social crimes, but also false theology. "You Christians pretend to believe in One God, but in your Old Testament you tell us of a God who appears to the patriarchs and converses with them in human form. How can you reconcile the attributes of the Supreme

God high above all existence with the attributes of the Old Testament God."

The defenders of Christianity accept the God of the philosophers, but point out that there is room or, rather, need for a Divine mediator to correlate the manifold of Nature with the unity of the Absolute God. He who spoke with the Fathers was not the Absolute, but God in a secondary relation—in fact, a secondary God. He, who was afterwards to become Incarnate as the Son of God, was in old time the Word by whom God spoke to His saints.

It is to be noted that in these early discussions the Person of Christ, as God's Word and Son, stands in the foreground. The Holy Spirit, His Being and Work, is taken for granted, and receives more distinct theological attention when the great crucial question is settled. Then all falls into place, but this belongs to the post-Nicene age. At present we are concerned with the doctrine of our Lord and Saviour, the Son of God.

III.—Origen.

The attempts of the Apologists to reconcile the highest doctrine of God with certain features of the Old Testament set the Christian intellect to work at the problem of combining in one idea the Absoluteness of God with the true Divinity of Christ. Most conspicuous in this endeavour was the great Alexandrine teacher Origen. Origen represents the culmination of early Christian apology and the first attempt at a comprehensive restatement of Christian belief in terms of Greek or, more properly speaking, of Platonic thought. The Apologists had made previous attempts at this, and the Gnostics had propounded systems of more or less Greek thought in more or less Christian terms. But Origen goes far deeper than any Apologist or Gnostic. For the determining idea of God he goes to the Divine Love. The aloofness and impassibility of the Absolute God is broken into by "the passion of love." The antithesis to the Divine perfection is not mere finitude, but evil. To meet and conquer evil, the co-eternal Word of God takes a human body and soul, a soul untainted by sin. The Incarnate Word co-eternal with but subordinate to the Father was born, suffered, and rose again for our salvation.

It is impossible within our limits to attempt any adequate account of Origen's system (the present writer has attempted this in Vol. IV. of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Library, pp. xxiv and xxv). Suffice it to say that Origen's theology, with the omission of certain paradoxes, came to dominate far and wide in the Greek-speaking churches of the third and fourth centuries.

IV.—Beginnings of Arianism.

The school of Origen has been held responsible for the rise of Arianism, but the more this view is examined the less likely it appears. Arius was, it is true, a Presbyter of Alexandria, but he stands out in opposition to the Bishop and leading theological influences of that Church, and he had gone for his theological studies to the famous Lucian of Antioch, who comes out more and more as the real moulding influence which made Arius and his friends what they were.

Briefly, Lucian taught that the Word or Son of God was a created God, high above all angels, and mediator between God and man in the work of creation and redemption alike. He became incarnate in the sense that He dwelt in a human body: *Deus sapientiam suam in mundum misit carne vestitam.*

It is impossible on grounds of evidence and doctrine alike not to trace in the system of Lucian the influence of Paul of Samosata (A.D. 269-272). The heterodox Bishop of Antioch, Paul, was a monarchian in the adoptionist or Unitarian sense. The Word, an impersonal Power of God, indwelt the Man Jesus from His baptism onwards. Our Lord became God by moral progress. This doctrine was strongly censured by the Episcopate generally. But Paul had a strong following, including the great scholar Lucian, who remained outside Church communion for some years after Paul's deposition. Lucian's position with regard to the Person of Christ was an attempted advance from Paul's Unitarianism. According to Lucian the Word of God not only indwelt Jesus Christ, but was the seat of His Personality. But, on the other hand, the Son or Word of God was a created being, and His mediatorial function consisted in His standing as God outside the Godhead of the Father, and in His Manhood with the Word as His Soul. Whereas the Catholic Faith demanded a mediator who was both God and man, Lucian and his school offered a mediator who was neither. Lucian was a great scholar and teacher and founded a school of enthusiastic followers uniting, as he did, passionate devotion with clear, cold reasoning of the Aristotelian type. Among his pupils were Eusebius of Nicomedia and Arius.

The controversy blazed out about 318-319. Arius, a lay-teacher, but afterwards a Presbyter at Alexandria, was clearly a man of brilliant personal gifts. He appears to have challenged some theological statements of the Bishop (Alexander) as Sabellian, arguing that the Son of God must have come into being later than the Father. The controversy became acute. Many laity and clergy, and at least two Bishops, took sides with Arius, but the bulk of the clergy joined Bishop Alexander

in proceedings against Arius and his party, who were finally deposed by a Synod. Arius began to enlist foreign support, including that of Eusebius, just translated from the See of Berytus to that of Nicomedia.

V.—The General Council.

Gradually the quarrel infected the whole Church—bishops colliding with bishops "like the fabled Symplegades"; the most sacred subjects were bandied to and fro in the mouths of the people, heathen as well as Christian.

Already we become conscious of a genius at work in the Church of Alexandria. Athanasius, a deacon of the Church, was making his mark as a draftsman of the Acts of the Synod of A.D. 321, and other important documents. In 324 Alexandria received an important visitor in the famous Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, the bearer of a letter from the Christian Emperor Constantine, entreating both parties to make peace. Hosius seems to have reported to his Imperial master strongly on the side of Alexander. Constantine soon wrote a vehement letter of rebuke to Arius. This he now followed up by the momentous decision to summon a Council of Bishops of the whole world to decide all questions at issue, especially that of doctrine.

The Christian Church was already used to Councils, but so far they had been local or at most regional. The only exception, that of Arles in 314, had not dealt with doctrine. The idea of a General Council was that of a world-wide remedy for schism. The heads of all the Churches of Christendom were to meet in free and brotherly deliberation, and testify to all the world their agreement in the Faith handed down independently but harmoniously from the earliest times in Churches widely remote in situation and separated by differences of language, race, and civilization. This idea is grand and impressive, and in the history of Councils that of Nicea alone embodies its approximate realization.

VI.—At Nicea.

The Council assembled in 325, the Emperor being present in person. Although unbaptized, he conducted the proceedings of the Council either personally or through Hosius. Membership of the Council was limited to Bishops. The impressive picture of a theological duel between Athanasius and Arius before the august tribunal of the assembled episcopate lacks foundation in fact. But no doubt Athanasius rendered invaluable services to his bishop in the less formal proceedings on which so much practically depended.

The doctrinal issue called for a decision, but it could not be reached at first. The way was blocked by other business, including not only the weightier matters eventually embodied in canons, but also a host of complaints on personal matters, which the Emperor settled at one blow by ordering the whole mass of *gravamina* to be committed to the flames.

The way was now clear for doctrinal decisions, but how did the bishops stand with regard to them, and what form were they to take? As to this last point, it seems to have been generally assumed that the Council must put forth a statement of Faith, whether of its own drafting or based on existing creeds.

The Arian section, about thirteen in number, was led by Eusebius of Nicomedia. He took the bull by the horns by propounding a formula of his own, but he was hopelessly shouted down by the angry Fathers, and the Arians, with two stubborn exceptions, eventually subscribed to the Creed of the Council.

On the other hand, a thoroughly reasoned position against Arianism was taken up by a minority only, although this minority carried the day. Of this wing Alexander of Alexandria was the central figure, although the formula adopted by the Council came from other minds. It came from two concurrent influences—namely, that of the strictest traditionalists and anti-Origenists of the East, led by Marcellus of Ancyra and Eustathius of Antioch, a handful of Eastern Bishops with Hosius and the Westerns. A mere handful, but including the delegates of Silvester, Bishop of Rome. The bulk of the bishops suspected Marcellus and his party, but were prepared to go all lengths in rejecting the document put forward by Eusebius of Nicomedia. They were traditionalists like the others, but represented a qualified traditionalism influenced by more or less modified Origenism.

This middle party, if party it can be called, numbered some four-fifths of the whole body of those present, say about two hundred bishops. Their spokesman and leader was Eusebius of Cæsarea, the most learned Churchman of the age and the father of Church history. His was a comprehensive rather than a penetrating mind. With Marcellus he was bitterly out of sympathy; without being an Arian he comes forward with proposals for compromise, and in him his astute namesake of Nicomedia found a useful ecclesiastical ally. But this belongs to the sequel of the Council. Meanwhile the Nicomedian had placed Arianism in a light abhorrent to all present excepting his handful of immediate followers. The question was, What step must be taken not to condemn Arianism—that was done already—but to put something effective in its place? Eusebius of Cæsarea came forward with a new proposal for peace. He

propounded the baptismal creed of his own Church with a slight addition directed against Sabellianism. The Emperor expressed his eagerness that this creed be adopted with the single improvement of the Homousion. Behind the throne we seem to catch the whisper of the prompter, Hosius. The suggestion thus quietly made was momentous in its results. The Homousion was agreed to and, after a short process of redrafting, the Creed of Cæsarea took shape as the Creed of the Nicene Council. All was ready; the Council closed its ranks and marched triumphantly to its close. All present signed—all the leading Arians, including the Bishop of Nicomedia; only two refused—bitter Egyptian irreconcilables. As the two departed to exile, they scornfully warned their leader, Eusebius, that he could not long escape the same fate. This came true. But in 329 Eusebius was back again and high in Imperial favour, persuading Constantine that Arius and himself held substantially the Creed of Nicea. Meanwhile, Bishop Alexander was failing in health. He had written his Easter letter for the year 328, but on April 17 he died, and on June 8 Athanasius, aged barely thirty, was chosen bishop in his stead.

VII.—The Situation after Nicea.

The great Council had left no doubt possible as to their horror of Arianism, which they had banished from the Church by an inexorable formula. But in the immediate sequel we find a majority of the Eastern bishops, especially in Syria and Asia Minor, in full reaction against the Council, first against the leaders of the victorious party and then, for more than thirty years, against the Creed itself. The Creed prevailed in time, but only as the result of slowly growing conviction on the merits of the formula.

That Arianism was a novelty all were agreed, but the Homousion did not commend itself to all as the necessary alternative. To begin with, the word was open to philosophical objection, for the idea of substance common to the Father and the Son suggested some entity prior to both alike, or, as inserted in the Creed, it seemed to bear the meaning of individual substance of which the three Persons of the Holy Trinity were but modes—the exact doctrine of Sabellius; further, the term was unscriptural; and last, but not least, the term had been condemned by the Council of Antioch which deposed Paul of Samosata in 269. The latter Council had apparently condemned the term as Sabellian or Unitarian.

All the above objections were *bona fide* held and, of course, eagerly taken up by the Arians. The result was a general

feeling among the bishops that the Homousion had been sprung upon the Council, and that time was needed to weigh it in all its bearings. The question really was, not whether the Homousion occurred in Scripture, but whether it was expressive of a Scriptural idea. This was the subject of debate between Athanasius and his opponents for a generation after the Council. The traditionalist majority eventually came round to the conclusion that Athanasius was right.

Constantine made a great blunder in inflicting banishments and other hardships on the leading Arians. In many cases they were quickly recalled by the influence of friends at court, but the less fortunate ones carried on a bitter propaganda wherever they went, making proselytes wherever possible, such as the two young bishops, Valens of Mursa (Mitrovitz) and Ursacius of Singidunum (Belgrade), who became protagonists of later Arianism.

A court party favourable to Arius quickly formed round Eusebius of Nicomedia. It was a party, not of doctrine, but of action and intrigue. We might call them Eusebians, but for the risk of confusing the Nicomedian with his namesake of Cæsarea. Eusebius and his fellows might be classed as political Arians. Within three years of the Council, Constantine had begun to waver, not in his resolute maintenance of the Creed, but in his sternness towards its notorious opponents. He desired Unity and knew that the Episcopate of Asia Minor was dissatisfied. He missed Eusebius and recalled him, and after a short time recalled Arius also, on his submitting a general assurance of his agreement with the Creed of Nicea.

Although the members of the Episcopate changed, the Nicene party in Asia Minor and Syria remained in a hopeless minority. The traditionalist or Conservative party were mostly short-sighted men, prone to acquiesce in things as they were. If by Conservatism we mean truly preservative action, then Athanasius and the Nicene leaders were the only Conservatives. At any rate, the Arian leaders saw their opportunity. They inaugurated a confused succession of personal skirmishes in which the mass of men saw no religious principle nor any combined purpose. The Arian organizers alone had a fixed, steady aim. But their machinations would have been powerless but for the background of widespread misgiving, which, in turn, would have died down but for the support of the court. Till Constantine died the authority of the Council remained unchallenged. But controversy was active; it centred round the person of Marcellus, whose doctrine certainly represented a marked Unitarian tendency. He was not a pure Sabellian, adding, as he did, his own explanation of the Divine Trinity

as an unfolding and refolding of the Godhead. Eusebius attacked him fiercely, and Athanasius never threw him over, but the sinister fact remained that Marcellus' principal disciple, Photinus, Bishop of Sirmium, was a stark and uncompromising Unitarian. Photinus was the scandal of Marcellus, Marcellus of the Council of Nicea.

It is impossible within our limits to trace the ecclesiastical ebb and flow as reflected in the numerous Councils of the early post-Nicene period. Those which were held under the influence of Eusebius of Nicomedia and his supporters were Tyre and Jerusalem (335), Constantinople (336), Antioch (339-340 and 341), Philippopolis (343), Antioch (344), Sirmium (347, 351, and 359), Ariminium and Seleucia (359). Of these, definitely Arian was Sirmium (357) and Constantinople (360). Definitely Catholic was the Council of Sardica (Sofia), held in 343, and, above all, Alexandria (362). Those held before 341 were mainly concerned with charges against individual bishops. Creeds of varying degrees of merit were put forward with the general aim of quietly superseding the Nicene formula. Thus many Councils not strictly Arian were more or less implicated in Arianism by their creeds. Not till 357 did the third Council of Sirmium loudly proclaim the prohibition of ousia as a term to be included in the Creed. But this prohibition was aimed not only at the Nicene party, but at the traditionalists who, in an increasing degree, were feeling their way towards the Homousion. So far they were prepared to accept Homoion ("like" the Father), a comprehensive proposal designed to attract the traditionalists while admitting the Arians through an open door. Likeness is a relative term, and its use was quite compatible with affirming some degree of unlikeness. In fact, the Arians who scorned compromise soon boldly put forth the watchword Anomœon ("unlike"). This party began, later on, to harden down to a sect under the leadership of Eunomius. The traditionalists would only accept the Homoion with the addition of ousion—the likeness between Son and Father must extend to substance. This explanation was almost as fatal to the Arian position as the Homousion itself. One more attempt was made by the Homoians to secure some colourable adhesion from among the traditionalist majority. They succeeded for a moment at Ariminum and Seleucia (359). "The whole world groaned and marvelled to find itself Arian."

VIII.—Athanasius and the Nicene Rally.

Athanasius was waiting and saw his opportunity. In his exile (356 to 362) he had been watching and writing. In his three famous *Discourses Against the Arians* he struck hard, but

with discriminating aim. While insisting with full vigour on Homousion, he more frequently employs the elements of the conception than the word itself. And after Ariminum he warmly greets the growingly perceptible rally of the Asian Bishops to the Nicene cause. To Basil of Ancyra, a spokesman of the rally, he holds out a warm greeting, while in his choice of terms he freely uses both "like" and "like in substance" of the relation between the Divine Son and the Divine Father, only insisting that the sincere use of these terms involves the principle of the Homousion. In November, 361, Constantius, the Arianizing Emperor, died, and on February 9, 362, Imperial notices were posted on the walls of Alexandria enforcing Julian's edict for the recall of exiled bishops. On February 21 Athanasius was at home again, and lost no time in calling a Council of Bishops who had suffered in the Arian persecution.

Before speaking of this Council, which virtually closes our story, we must ask attention to the absence from the above account of the term *semi-Arian*. The name was invented by Epiphanius, a generation later on, to designate the traditionalist bishops, most of whom eventually rallied to the Nicene cause. Enough has been said to indicate their general position. Their natural leader, immediately after the Council, was Eusebius of Cæsarea. Later on, among its leaders were Basil of Ancyra, Cyril of Jerusalem, and others. The events of Antioch furnished a rallying-point to those who were less likely to be directly influenced by Athanasius.

Meanwhile the Homoians were initiating an aggressive step against the bishops identified with the Nicene rally. Before the death of Constantius, deposition of several leaders was voted at Constantinople in 360; and at Antioch the new bishop, Meletius, was summarily deposed when, on his installation, he gave in with no uncertain sound his adhesion to the Homousion (361).

IX.—The Council of the Confessors.

The Council of the Confessors in 362 was confronted with the situation in Antioch. Who was the lawful bishop there? Meletius was acclaimed by the majority, including a large nucleus who had, while unwillingly acquiescing in bishops of doubtful orthodoxy, vigorously upheld the Nicene faith. On the other hand, since the deposition of Eustathius (330) an obdurate minority had refused to acknowledge any new bishop, or to worship with those who did. Their leader was the presbyter, Paulinus, and Athanasius himself, when on a visit to Antioch, had associated himself with the party of Paulinus.

Moreover, Lucifer of Cagliari had, instead of joining in the Council of Confessors, taken his own line, in order to force the hand of the Council. He hurried to Antioch and consecrated Paulinus bishop. Which bishop, then, was the Council to recognise? Before they could decide this they had a still more difficult question to settle. The Council of Nicea had enacted the Homousion, but the word *usia* was not the only technical term involved. What of hypostasis? Was it right to speak of the Triune God as one usia and hypostasis, or as one usia and three hypostases? In the latter case, hypostasis is clearly the equivalent of the Latin *persona:* three Persons and one God. In the other case, hypostasis finds its equivalent in the Latin *substantia*, one uni-substantial God. But if Paulinus were right his adherents claimed that the Homousion, conceded with one hand, was withdrawn by the other. The issue between the majority and minority at Antioch seemed to the latter to involve the Homousion itself.

On the other hand, the latter term was open to a twofold sense. Usia, in its "primary" Aristotelian sense, meant the one individual thing, and at Nicea those who inserted it in the Creed had no other sense in mind than that it proclaimed the unity of God, the *Una Res* of the Godhead, in which unity Father, Son, and Spirit were one.

But the formula of Chalcedon (451) employs the term *usia* in Aristotle's "secondary" sense of "one substance with the Father according to His Godhead, and of one substance with us according to His Manhood." If the language of Chalcedon is right, and Christ is of one substance with man as two different men share in the same "substance," one human nature, is there not a risk of one Council abating somewhat of the unity of the Holy and Undivided Trinity as proclaimed by the older Council.

Had the Council of the Confessors attempted what some of them desired, to decide absolutely between the one hypostasis and the three, the Church would have been driven to choose between confounding the Persons (hypostases) and dividing the substance (usia). It was Athanasius who guided them, under God, to a wiser decision.

X.—Conclusion.

Both uses of the terms were recognized as permissible. All must agree to the Homousion, but those who, in accepting it, pleaded for the recognition of three hypostases, may abound in their own sense, only recognizing that the question is one of technical terms and not of faith.

Neither Paulinus nor Lucifer was satisfied, but the Church at large breathed freely. The door was thrown wide open to those who were Nicene at heart, but hampered by verbal objections. The Council of the Confessors, to quote Jerome once again, had " snatched the world from the jaws of Satan."

And what of the modern world ? Amidst all perplexities, is it not of vital moment that the Church, at the parting of the ways (325-362), stood firm, rejected the created God and the unreal man of the Arian Christology, and held fast to the Divine Mediator within the unity of the Godhead and none the less truly man ?

Rightly did Athanasius insist: " We are fighting for our all."

In the Christ of Nicea the Church offers to all the assurance of a Mediator, a true Mediator at once God and man. The sinner needs no more, the saint needs no less.

ARCHIBALD ROBERTSON (BISHOP).

WHAT THE FIRST CHRISTIANS BELIEVED ABOUT JESUS OF NAZARETH

FOR an English critic the natural starting-point of an enquiry into " What the First Christians Believed about Jesus of Nazareth " is St. Peter's speeches in *Acts ;* but since the Liberal critics of Germany, with the notable exceptions of Harnack and Eduard Meyer, still, for the most part, deny or doubt that St. Luke was the author of this book, and, in any case, regard the early part of the writer's historical narrative with considerable suspicion, the safer course will be to start with the undisputed evidence of St. Paul's Epistles, and only to employ *Acts* as a secondary authority—at least, until our researches have proved its history to be trustworthy on the ground of its general agreement with St. Paul.

I

In view of recent discussions on the Continent, which have had their echoes also in England, it will be well in the first place to ask the fundamental question, Does the worship or " cult " of Jesus as " Lord " (the " Kyrios-cult " as Bousset and Heiler are fond of calling it) go back, as Heiler in agreement with most English critics contends, to Pentecost or even to the Resurrection; or did it first arise, as is also influentially maintained, in a heathen environment, being in fact a product, not of genuine Christian principles, but of conscious or unconscious imitation by St. Paul and his Gentile communities of the polytheistic

worship of such heathen "lords" and "saviours" as Dionysus, Osiris, Attis, and Orpheus, in the popular mystery-religions?

Very strong—in my opinion quite conclusive—evidence against the alleged heathen origin of the title "Lord," as applied to Jesus, is afforded by the Aramaic watchword *Māranâ' thâ* (Μαρανὰ θά),* which St. Paul employs in 1 *Cor.* xvi. 22, and evidently assumes to be familiar and intelligible to the Corinthians to whom he wrote. This expression is best translated "O our Lord, come," and since an Aramaic prayer of this kind can only have originated in the Mother Church of Jerusalem, it furnishes satisfactory proof, (1) that even before St. Paul's conversion, the primitive community spoke of Jesus as "Lord," or "our Lord"; (2) that they looked and hoped for His Second Coming to Judgment (the Parusia).

Both these conclusions are amply confirmed by the evidence of *Acts* (see ii. 36; x. 42), which is thus shown to be historically reliable in two most important particulars.

That the title "Lord" did not originate in the Pauline communities is further made clear by the independent evidence of the Epistle to the Romans. Though the Roman Christians had not been evangelized by St. Paul (*Rom.* xv. 20), he is able to assume that the watchword, "Jesus is Lord," is as familiar to them as to the Christians whom he had himself instructed (see 1 *Cor.* xii. 3). The significant statement (*Rom.* x. 9), "because (*or* that) if thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thine heart that God raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved," can *only* mean (taken in connection with its context) that even before St. Paul wrote to the Romans, the Lordship of Jesus was already an article of formulated faith among them, and that to confess it publicly was considered no less essential to salvation than belief in the Resurrection itself.

If *Ephesians* is a genuine Pauline Epistle (as in spite of certain well-known difficulties I still believe it to be), it affords further early evidence that, not only in the Churches founded by the Apostle of the Gentiles, but universally throughout the Christian world, faith in the "one Lord" ranked in importance with faith in the "one God" (*Eph.* iv. 5).

II

Before enquiring what precisely was meant by the title "Lord," as applied to Jesus, it will be convenient to ascertain (so far as the somewhat scanty evidence permits) what other

* It is thus that Professor G. A. Cooke transliterates these difficult words, following Dalman. Some critics, however, still prefer to divide the words as in W. H.'s text (Μαρὰν ἀθά), which would mean, "The Lord (*or* our Lord) has come"—hardly (as the R.V. translates) "The Lord cometh."

beliefs concerning His Person and Work were officially professed by the Christian community before St. Paul's conversion.

The *locus classicus* is, of course 1 *Cor.* xv. 1 *ff.*: "I declare unto you the Gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye received, wherein also ye stand, by which also ye are saved. . . . For I delivered unto you as among the essential truths (ἐν πρώτοις), that which I also received (παρέλαβον), that (ὅτι) Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that (ὅτι) He was buried, and that (ὅτι) He hath been raised on the third day according to the Scriptures, and that (ὅτι) He appeared to Cephas, then to the Twelve. Afterwards He appeared [notice that ὅτι is here omitted] to above five hundred brethren at once," etc.

Practically all critics agree that St. Paul received this detailed information, not directly from the Lord,* but from other believers at the time of or shortly after his conversion. The only question that requires discussion is *the degree of accuracy* with which St. Paul here reproduces this primitive tradition. The older view was that he reproduces it in substance, not verbally. The newer view (advocated, for example, by Eduard Meyer, Harnack, Norden, and Holl) is that the three ὅτι's are marks of quotation, and that accordingly we have here St. Paul's verbatim translation into Greek of five articles of a primitive Aramaic creed, which was current in the Church of Jerusalem (and also, of course, in that of Damascus) before his conversion —that is, within five years of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus. The Creed ran: (1) "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures"; (2) "He was buried"; (3) "He hath been raised on the third day according to the Scriptures"; (4) "He appeared to Cephas"; (5) "Then to the Twelve."†

"These firmly formulated doctrinal statements," writes Dr. Eduard Meyer in his recent authoritative work on Christian origins, "which Paul took over as a leading feature (*Hauptstück*) of the Gospel, and proclaimed more widely, form the kernel of the 'joyful message' of the Gospel with which the missionaries of the primitive society went forth into the world

* Dr. E. Meyer is quite justified in insisting that the contradiction between this passage and *Gal.* i. 12, where St. Paul states that he received his Gospel, not from man, but directly from the Lord, is more apparent than real. The *substance* of His Gospel (the Incarnation, Atoning Death, and Resurrection of the Messiah) he doubtless received by immediate revelation. On the other hand, he derived from ecclesiastical tradition *the phraseology and the fixed formulæ* in which he communicated his Gospel to converts. He says nothing about his debt to tradition in *Galatians*, because he is there defending against objectors his claim to dependent apostolic authority.

† The words which follow, not being introduced by ὅτι, are considered, not to be part of the actual creed, but to belong to the official explanation and comment which was given to converts along with it. The actual baptismal confession was probably "Jesus (*or* Jesus Christ) is Lord," the additional articles of the creed being taught after baptism.

to convert mankind to faith in Jesus the Messiah. Paul had already learnt to know their content, when he persecuted the new sect with passionate zeal. . . . The bodily resurrection of Jesus and His numerous appearances to the disciples belong to those traditions of Christianity which are the earliest and were the first to be expressed in a fixed formula. Paul received this formula, from which the [Church's] Creed has been gradually developed, after his conversion, during his time of instruction at Damascus. . . . It manifestly goes back to the primitive society at Jerusalem . . . and was originally composed in Aramaic." He speaks of it as "by far the oldest document of the Christian Church which we possess" (*Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, vol. iii., p. 209 *ff.*; vol. i., p. 11 *ff.*).*

III

If the aforementioned critical results are accepted, important inferences follow for theology.

In the first place, we shall have definitely to abandon as antiquated the widely held theory, popularized in England by the Bampton Lectures of the late Dr. Rashdall, that the doctrine of the Atonement, as ordinarily understood, is not original, but was first introduced into Christian theology by St. Paul. If Dr. Meyer and his supporters are right, even before Saul of Tarsus became a Christian, the article "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures" already formed part of a fixed and authoritative Creed; nor is there the least reason to doubt that the passage of Scripture especially alluded to was *Isaiah* liii., which speaks of God as making the soul of His Righteous Servant "a guilt-offering for sin," and as laying upon Him "the iniquity of us all."

Clearly, therefore, the Christian community from Pentecost onward believed that Christ was not only "Lord," but also "Redeemer" and "Saviour." Hence there is no sufficient reason for rejecting the statements in *Acts* (1) that Philip the Evangelist made *Isaiah* liii. the basis of his discourse to the Ethiopian Eunuch; and (2) that Peter and John declared before the Council that "in none other is salvation, for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved" (*Acts* iv. 12; viii. 31 *ff.*).

The fact that the doctrine of the Atonement was thus early formulated strongly favours the view that it goes back, in principle at least, to Jesus Himself; and that our earliest evangelist is not guilty of an anachronism in attributing to Him the state-

* Meyer is the present-day Mommsen, the most authoritative of continental classical historians.

ment that He came to lay down His life as " a ransom for many," and the declaration that the Cup of the Eucharist is " My blood of the covenant which is shed for many " (*Mark* x. 45; xiv. 24).

The Epistle to the Romans also lends support to the view that the doctrine of salvation through the death of Christ did not originate with St. Paul. Throughout this Epistle he assumes without argument that Redemption through the Precious Blood of Christ is as fundamental a belief of the Roman Christians as of himself (*Rom.* iii. 24 *ff.*; etc.). He uses elaborate arguments to establish his own special view of the relation of Faith to Salvation, but none to establish what both he and they obviously regard as the self-evident proposition that Christ died for sin.

IV

With regard to the words " and that He was buried," which occur between the credal articles which speak of Christ's Death and Resurrection, practically all critics, including even Schmiedel, accept them as proof that for St. Paul, at any rate, the Resurrection of Jesus meant His Resurrection, not merely from Hades, but also from the tomb.

The new view requires us to hold in addition, that St. Paul's belief in this matter was shared by the Twelve, with the result that we must abandon as unsupported by evidence the popular critical theory that what the first Christians believed in was, not the reanimation of the crucified and buried body, but the appearance on the third day of the Lord's immortal and glorified spirit, either entirely disembodied, or clothed in a " spiritual body " not identical with or organically connected with the buried body. As philosophers we are entitled to hold, if we will, that the reanimation of a dead body, and its instantaneous metamorphosis into a spiritual and glorious body (which is what Orthodoxy understands by the Resurrection) is too amazing a miracle to be credited; but as impartial historians we are bound to admit that whether the buried body actually rose or not, the Christian Church was founded on the firm belief that it did.

Here, again, the Acts of the Apostles is shown to be a reliable historical authority, for (as is well known) it represents the original Apostles (ii. 27; x. 41) as well as St. Paul (xiii. 37) as insisting that God did not permit the holy flesh of the Messiah to see corruption.

V

We are now in a position to consider the primitive doctrine of Christ's Person as a whole.

It has occasionally been maintained in ancient, but more

often in modern, times, that the earliest Christians were "Adoptionists" in belief; in other words, that they did not regard Jesus as a Divine Person who had become man, but rather as a human person who had become God, or in some vague way "divine." It is suggested that, just as the heathen believed that such heroes and benefactors of mankind as Hercules, Æsculapius, Orpheus, and Augustus, had been deified after death as a reward of virtue, so the first Christians believed that Jesus, in recognition of his unexampled services to the human race, had been "adopted" to be the Son of God, and having thus been exalted to divine rank had become a worthy object of religious worship.

Superficially this view is plausible. It is certain that the developed doctrine of the Incarnation formed no part of the Apostles' missionary preaching. No statement in St. Peter's recorded sermons definitely excludes Adoptionism, and the peroration of his sermon at Pentecost, "God hath *made* Him [Jesus] both Lord and Christ" has even been thought to favour it.*

We must beware, however, of supposing that these sermons, addressed in every case to the unbaptized, contain all the doctrine concerning Christ's Person which St. Peter had to communicate. Caution is suggested by St. Paul's missionary sermon at Pisidian Antioch (*Acts* xiii. 16 *ff.*), which also contains no statement inconsistent with Adoptionism; while yet we know for certain from his undisputed Epistles that he both held and taught his converts (of course, *after* their baptism) a highly elaborate theory of the Incarnation of the pre-existent Son of God, the Mediator of Creation as well as of Redemption, which entirely excludes Adoptionism (*Phil.* ii. 5 *ff.*; *Col.* i. 15 *ff.*; 1 *Cor.* viii. 6; 2 *Cor.* viii. 9). Had St. Paul's own writings perished, the critics who now claim St. Peter as an Adoptionist would have claimed St. Paul with no less confidence as of the same opinion.

All that we really have a right to conclude from the evidence is that in the earliest period the teaching given before baptism was exceedingly simple, and was more concerned with facts than with theories. Jesus had risen, Jesus had ascended, Jesus was at the right hand of God as "Lord of all," Jesus was about to return to judge the world and to establish the Kingdom, Jesus was the Messiah whom the prophets expected, Jesus was the dispenser of the Spirit—beyond these affirmations the missionary preaching of the Apostles hardly went. Converts were often baptized wholesale, after hearing a single sermon,

* Without warrant, however, for St. Paul, whom no one claims as an Adoptionist, uses very similar language in *Phil.* ii., 9 and elsewhere.

upon the mere profession of their repentance for past sin, and their belief in Jesus as Lord and Christ. We learn, however, that after baptism systematic and apparently daily instruction (διδαχή) was given by the Apostles in the principles of the Christian faith (*Acts* ii. 42). That the post-baptismal teaching given by St. Paul was not Adoptionist we know for certain; and since the early disputes between St. Paul and the Twelve turned, not on the doctrine of the Person of Christ, but on such comparatively minor matters as the position of Gentile converts and the authority of the Law, the natural inference to draw is that the post-baptismal teaching given by the Twelve was not Adoptionist either. St. Paul gives not the slightest indication that the Twelve differed from him in their view of Christ's Person and work, and assuredly no ground for such a supposition can be found in 1 Peter.

VI

The crucial—and, as it appears to me, the absolutely fatal—objection to the Adoptionist theory, is the polytheistic view of God which it implies. If one virtuous human being can be exalted for his merits to divine rank and lawfully worshipped, so also can another, and the way is opened to unlimited polytheism.

Now the view of God which Jesus and the Apostles inherited from the Prophets was undoubtedly a rigidly monotheistic one. The Prophets held that God was an absolutely unique Being, and His attributes incommunicable. Whereas the heathen regarded the attribute of divinity as communicable, as capable of degrees, and as being, in fact, shared in unequal measure by a vast graduated hierarchy of gods, dæmons, nature-spirits, demigods, and deified mortals, the Hebrews concentrated it in a single unique Being, who was "a jealous God," claiming all religious worship exclusively for Himself: "I am the Lord; that is My name; and My glory will I not give to another, nor My praise to graven images" (*Isa.* xlii. 8).

That men holding such a view of God as this can have worshipped Jesus, believing Him to have begun His career as a mortal, is at once a rational and a psychological impossibility. It is true that they believed in the Resurrection of Jesus in a sense which involved His Ascension, but this was no justification from the Jewish standpoint for worshipping Him. Enoch and Elijah, and in New Testament times Moses also, were believed thus to have ascended, but they were never worshipped on that account. That typical Jews, such as the Apostles were, can have paid to their Hero (as the theory of Adoptionism supposes) a worship identical in character with that paid by

their heathen contemporaries to Romulus, Hercules, Æsculapius, Alexander, and Julius, is so exceedingly improbable that nothing but demonstrative evidence ought to induce us to credit it. What the Jews felt on this subject is shown by the graphic scene described by Josephus when "they threw themselves down upon their faces and stretched out their neck to be slain, and did this forty days together . . . resolving rather to die willingly than see the erection of Caius's statue" (*Antiq.*, xviii. 8).

That the Christians agreed with them is plain both from St. Paul, who regards it as the crowning enormity of the Man of Sin that "he sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God" (2 *Thess.* ii. 4), and from the *Apocalypse*, which makes the supreme blasphemy of the Beast to consist in his demand that his subjects should worship his image and those of other deified mortals (*Rev.* xiii., and *passim*). One and only one theory of the nature of Jesus could possibly justify *Jews* in worshipping Him, and that is His true and proper deity.

VII

The truth is that, though the title "God" (θεός), especially with the article, was reserved to the Father alone in the primitive period, and was not often applied to Jesus even by St. Paul and St. John, yet the corresponding title κύριος or "Lord" (in Aramaic *Mar* or *Maran*; in Hebrew, *'ădônai*), which was almost universally substituted for the divine name Yahweh in the Greek Old Testament and even in the Hebrew text as actually read, was applied to Jesus from the time of His Exaltation with the full consciousness that He was "Lord" in the sense in which the Yahweh of the Old Testament was "Lord"; and since there could not possibly be two "Lords" in this sense, for Yahweh was Lord Omnipotent, it followed that Jesus was fundamentally identical in being and nature with Him, and was entitled, like Him, to prayer and worship (*Acts* i. 24; vii. 59-60; ix. 14). The primitive worship offered to Jesus was accordingly strictly monotheistic worship—different not merely in degree, but in kind, to the worship offered in the Græco-Roman world to deified heroes.

The Epistles of St. Paul, as a whole, afford strong confirmation of this view. St. Paul expressly denies that the Lordship which he attributed to Jesus had anything in common with that of such finite and limited "lords" as the heathen worshipped. Since in his theology the Son of God is the Father's agent in the creation of the universe, and is also the principle of its coherence and rational order, it is obvious that he regarded Jesus as "Lord of all"—*i.e.*, the sharer of the

indivisible omnipotence of the supreme God: "For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or on earth; as there are gods many and lords many; yet to us there is [but] one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto Him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through Him" (1 *Cor.* viii. 5).

It is deeply significant that he is able to assume that the Romans, who owed their Christianity to others, took the same view of the Lordship of Jesus as he did, and were prepared to draw with him from the admitted premiss that Jesus is Lord—Lord "over all," the obvious and necessary conclusion that He is also "God blessed for ever" (*Rom.* ix. 5).*

In agreement with this we find that in *Acts* also Jesus is expressly declared to be "Lord of all"—*i.e.*, Lord Omnipotent (see *Acts* x. 36), and since there cannot possibly be two such Lords (for they would limit one another), it follows that Jesus is not a second or inferior god, but is one in nature and fundamental being (in technical language "consubstantial") with the supreme and only God. With this accords the fact that He exercises the divine attribute of Judgment (x. 42), which, of course, involves omniscience (cp. already St. Peter's words in i. 24, "thou which knowest the hearts of all men"), as well as omnipotence.

Further, since God is eternal, Jesus must also be eternal, from which it follows necessarily that He pre-existed eternally in divine majesty in heaven before He humbled Himself to become man upon earth. Pre-existence, we may remind ourselves, and that in a state of divine glory, is part of the acknowledged meaning of the title "Son of Man,"† which, though not employed in St. Peter's speeches, was certainly familiar to the primitive Church, as is shown by its use by the dying martyr, St. Stephen (vii. 56).

The primitive formula, "Jesus is Lord," is often quoted as favouring inadequate views of Christ's Person, but if "Lord" is interpreted, as it certainly ought to be, not in the polytheistic, but in the monotheistic sense, then it involves implicitly, and was bound to lead in due course to the explicit confession of the doctrines of His deity, His consubstantiality, His pre-existence, His Incarnation—in fact, given the data of the Gospels, of the entire *credenda* of Nicæa, of Chalcedon, and even of the *Quicunque vult.*

CHARLES HARRIS.

* All other ways of construing this famous passage are forced and unnatural, (see Sanday and Headlam *in loc*). That the Son of God was in the essential form of God, and "equal" to God before His incarnation, is declared in *Phil.* ii. 6.

† "This Messianic Man," says Bousset, "is a supernatural figure; He comes from heaven, He was with God from the beginning of the world, He appears in the splendour of His divine glory, and He is actually the Judge of the world, thus displacing God Himself from that position" (*Jesus*, E.T., p. 187).

THE DYNAMIC OF THE INCARNATION*

So far as I am aware, no one has yet written a philosophy of nursery rhymes. For many generations thousands of children have been entertained, interested, and, we may venture to say, educated by the tales of Jack and Jill, Old Mother Hubbard, and the like, to such a degree that we are warranted in thinking that beneath these adventures there must be a core of meaning about life itself which is of great value for a developing mind. One rhyme, however, "Pussy-cat, Pussy-cat, where have you been?" embodies a principle of everyday experience, and is itself applicable to all forms of sentient life. The particular *elis domestica* whose excursion is brought before our notice in this rhyme was bent on seeing the Queen; but once arrived at the Palace, her attention was attracted not by the deference of courtiers, nor the care-worn faces of responsible people, nor yet by beautiful jewels, but by a tiny mouse beneath Her Majesty's chair. The principle that you see what you want to see, and what you have fitted yourself to see, however strange and wonderful your environment may be, is familiar to us all. If you are of the earth, your interests are remorselessly the interests of the "natural" man.

Even the scientist, be his detachment pronounced, never entirely frees himself from the results engrained by his own experience. Whether he works in the realm of philosophy, which, as far as it can, declares war on presuppositions of every sort, or in that of theology, which avows complete confidence in the inspiration of God, he is limited to some extent by his own mental habits and the outlook of his age. Luther would not have been the man he was, nor could his part in history have been the same, had he lived in the fourth century. St. Augustine's mind was the meeting-point of three distinct streams—Neo-Platonism, Manicheism, and Paulinism. Indeed, a historian does not think in dates and figures, but in terms of men who were the spokesmen of the ages that bore them. The Eternal Spirit of the Ages moves this way in this century and that way in that century, and it moves in the minds of men who become its incarnations. In our own day Western thought, at least, is dominated by the idea of progress. No doubt we have been chastened by the war, and we are slowly coming to see that progress is not, strictly speaking, manifested in the invention of a new type of aeroplane or dictaphone, but in the moral and spiritual sphere of men's lives. We have been taught by bitter

* A paper read at the Rupert's Land Diocesan Synod, June, 1924.

experiences—experiences still with us—that a mechanical invention may become a potent factor in limiting the attainment of the highest goods in human life. It is in movements like the World Conference on Faith and Order, the Copec Conference, and the League of Nations that we see progress.

With this thought in mind let us approach the key-principle of Christianity—the Incarnation—with a view to discovering at least one rich contribution which it makes to the idea of progress. We shall leave out of account its background and its presuppositions, and contemplate it as it carries men and women on towards the Divine goal. "The Word became flesh that He might make man capable of receiving deity," said Athanasius.* There is the fact and the purpose of the Incarnation coupled together; and it is to the purpose, "that He might make man capable of receiving deity," we shall direct our attention. We shall think of man becoming something that he is not by nature, through the Life of Christ. However true it may be that we see what we are fitted to see, and that we are what in the past we have allowed ourselves to become, it is far more true that by the grace of the Incarnate and Ascended Christ through the Holy Spirit, we have the power to determine the future, by bringing into the present that Power which alone hews out the highway of progress.

The Life of Christ, then, is the gift which man receives. But we must not be led astray by words in speaking of the Life of Christ as a Gift, for that Gift differs from all other gifts in a peculiar way. It is a living Gift. We speak of gifts such as money, jewellery, and books; and these gifts can be locked up in a safe if the possessor elects to take that course. He may be in China when they are in Peru. These things do not live, and they are things which, in Dean Inge's phrase, do not "hit us where we live." They are *ours* merely, they are not *us*. If we choose, we can throw them into the deep and conceal them for ever from sight and use. But Christ is a Gift in quite another sense. The Ascended Christ is a Personality in which all the excellences of Divine and human Character are expressed. He is the focus of Divine love, human love; Divine peace, human peace; Divine hope, human hope; and of all the other beautiful qualities of Personality. And it is these things He gives to us when He gives His Life. Love, joy, peace, are qualities that exist only in Personality. They are neither detachable things nor yet ideas of the reason or imagination; they are aspects of the Person of Christ. Love cannot be predicated of a stone or a jewel; it can be found only in a life, and the Life in which

* *Con. Ar.*, ii. 59.

it is found supremely and fully is the Life of Christ. A seed cannot grow on the wayside, for if by chance it happens to fall on that place which is not germane to it, it will disappear; whereas if it falls on good ground, it lives and grows. Christ's Life, His Gift, can only grow in germane soil—namely, the living souls of men. His Life has an essential connection with human life because He is Himself human, and to this cognate soil He transfers His richer and fuller Life, embodying all the excellences we could desire.

We see, then, that a Christ-bearer, as Ignatius called himself, is an incarnation of the mind of Christ. His love, and his courage, and whatever other noble qualities he may have, are the qualities of the Christ expressed in him. In the saints we see something of Christ. We cannot see the whole Christ, but we see Him in a glass darkly. However strong an electric current may be, you cannot receive a greater number of light units than the globe you use will bear; similarly, human nature, limited as it is, can manifest only a fragment of the Christ Life. But throughout the history of the Church there have been great and inspiring souls who have been gifted with some aspects of Christ, and certain of them are remembered in our Calendar. Every virtue they possessed was His alone. On St. John the Evangelist's Day we praise God for the manifestation of the Love of Christ in His beloved disciple; we think of John, not simply as a good man, but as a good man whose life was hid with Christ in God. On St. Peter's Day we think of one who was granted a great measure of Christ's hope; on St. Stephen's Day we recall a martyrdom of courage, a courage that pierced to heaven through the flying stones. Our Calendar is studded with examples of the Christ Life, and on its special days we make an act of faith in which we believe that Christ will shed these wonderful gifts upon us also and work our transformation. Great multitudes in post-New Testament times have revealed Christ just as surely. St. Boniface hated superstition; St. Hugh of Lincoln loved little children; St. Thomas Aquinas excelled in intellectual definition; in all ages and in all ways the Life of Christ has been revealed in men.

Now, once the Christian receives Christ's gift of Life in some of its many forms, he becomes a medium for the dissemination of Christ's gifts. Love, courage, and many others live in him, and they make their way out through him into the lives of other men. As Dean Inge says, "religion is caught, not taught." The Christ-Life uses the Christian as a transfer station whence gifts are sent in one direction or another. But there is one special direction in which all living gifts are sent, no matter where they are diverted, and that is to Christ Himself. Life in Him is

Self-giving; and in whomsoever that Life appears, it appears as a giving of that self to Christ. The gardener receives the fruit and the flower and the perfume from the living seeds he gave to the ground; so Christ the Sower receives back again to Himself the living gifts which He distributed. And since these gifts are really *ourselves*, and not merely *ours*, He really receives us into communion with Himself as living beings. We can only see Him as He is when we are like Him. Once His Mind has transformed us, transformed our outlook, and cured our past, we see Him as the Source of Life. In that Well of Water we behold our own reflections cast. We think and act and live as Christ lives in us, and we carry out His purpose when we carry out our own.

The Incarnation, then, from this point of view, is a wonderful exchange of Life between Christ and believers. Of course, the Source of that Life is in Him, and our sufficiency is of Him, but the very Life which He enfolds in us we return to Him. We reflect back to Him, for His glory, the light that flashes from Him to us. All discoveries of science, all inspirations of religious influence, all schemes for the enrichment of humanity, take their rise in Him, and in us they are multiplied, and as they develop we develop and progress in the moral and spiritual life. The improvements of human skill, in this case, are not used for purposes dangerous and harmful to human progress, but in its service. The Moving Picture industry becomes an element in the fulfilment of human destiny if offered to Christ for His glory. And so the Church Militant here on Earth is conceived as a multitude of centres of finite consciousness, all having their centre and pivot in the Infinite Christ Centre, and all that they are is caught from the Centre and returned to it again. In the words of Dr. Swete:

"The unity of believers, which reflects the unity of the Father and the Son, depends upon a gift which the Lord has already given to His Church. He has given her for this purpose the glory which He has Himself received from the Father. . . . The Father gave it to the Only-begotten Son in the mystery of the eternal generation. He had this glory before the world was, when He dwelt, God with God, in the yet unrevealed sanctuary of the Divine life. And this glory, so far as it can be imparted, He has given to all who believe in Him; not, indeed, His unique Sonship, not His incommunicable Godhead, but the glory of the Divine character; the Love which unites the Father and the Son, and is the Spirit of Both. This the Son can and does impart, and it is this which gives to the Church a unity analogous to that which exists in the interior life of God. By virtue of this Gift the Incarnate Son is in all believers as the Father is in the Son, and thus they are brought, so far as their limited nature permits, into a perfect unity to which nothing is wanting, and of which there will be no end."*

* *The Last Discourse and Prayer*, p. 180.

In the metaphor of the Lord of Life, the Church is a great loaf through which the energy of His Divine leaven is surging, unifying the whole lump and pervading it with a peculiar nature which in itself it lacks. The idea of progress, then, for us must mean the gradual transformation of our lives into manifestations of a Life which transcends all that we can think or imagine in such a way that we who become transformed enrich the whole of which we are vital elements. "The Word became flesh that He might make men capable of receiving deity." The dominating thought for us is the fulfilment of the promise of God with a greater certainty than the Psalmist could command when he sang, "The Lord gave the word, great was the company of the preachers."

Christ become man, and Christ making men spiritual men, by imparting to them the gifts of His own Life, are thoughts St. Augustine did not find in his Greek models; and yet it is amazing how much there is in the Dialogues of Plato about inspiration and the divinity of man. He realized that virtue and happiness could be attained only with the help of God. "Virtue," he tells us, "is neither natural nor acquired, but an instinct given by God to the virtuous."* Socrates, the ideal figure sketched in his pages, believed himself to be possessed of a special gift, and by his stinging dialectic presented to men the more excellent way. He was not disobedient to his own heavenly vision, and consecrated himself duly to the service of the God from whom he had received his gift of prophecy. Confident that he followed whither God led him, he could drink the hemlock and pass to the beyond.† Plato believed that a good man did not hew out his own statue unaided by God. Destiny is fulfilled by receiving what God gives. Moreover, God's service consists in returning to Him the very things which have come from him. "And greatly the gods honour the virtue of love," we read, "still more admired and valued and rewarded by them, for the lover is more divine; because he is inspired by God."‡

But you will observe that the great difference between Divine inspiration and Divine gifts in Platonism as against Christianity lies in the humanity of the Christian gifts. In Plato there is no Heavenly Man who imparts Himself to struggling men. The nexus between God and man is not there, simply because there is wanting the fact of the Word made flesh. The Platonic heavenly treasures can never be contained in earthly vessels simply because they are gifts not adapted to those vessels. But thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through Jesus Christ our Lord.

W. C. DE PAULEY.

* *Meno*, 99.

† *Phædo*, 62, 85; *Apol.*, 30 *ff.*; *Crito*, 54.

‡ *Sym.*, 180 (*cf.* Euthyp., 12 *ff.*).

THE NICENE CREED IN ACTION

My first impulse, on being asked by the Editor of Theology to write an article on "The Nicene Creed in Action," was to refuse as being in the midst of a Mission in Central London during Lent; but on second thoughts, the Mission on which I was engaged was the strongest argument for the power of the Nicene Creed in Action. What was the special subject of the Mission? *The Spirit of Jesus.*

But who was Jesus? Was I preaching day by day and night by night about a human character who appeared in the world 2,000 years ago and then disappeared? Certainly not. Then what Jesus Christ was I preaching, whose Spirit was to change the world to-day, without whose Spirit no League of Nations could bring peace to the world, and no agreement would ever be made between employers and employed in this country? Clearly it was the *Jesus Christ of the Nicene Creed.* He alone, God as well as Man, Man as well as God, alive to-day, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever—He alone was—to use Mr. Gladstone's phrase—"the one central Hope of our poor wayward race." Looking back from the vantage ground of the Mission, which I am now conducting, I see more clearly than I have ever seen that the Nicene Creed has been my guide and stay during more than forty years of ministry.

I was not ordained till the age of twenty-six, and during those four years between Oxford and Ordination, spent partly in Germany, partly in England, partly in Switzerland, I see now that what I was really waiting for was to see if I truly and *ex animo* believed in the Nicene Creed. An honest instinct told me that unless I could repeat that ancient symbol from my heart and assent to it with my mind and intellect, I had better not be ordained at all.

As a Young Man.—I remember a German Baroness saying to me in those days of doubt and indecision: "You an Oxford man, and still believe in the *wonders!*" This gentle scoff put me on my mettle and made me feel more sure than ever that if I could believe only in a non-miraculous Christ, I should be falling below the age-long standard of faith held up by the Christian Church.

Then came my ordination, when the blessed light shone at last, and, looking back on those early days of ministry, especially the sick-rooms, which are an unforgettable experience to every young man just ordained, I see more clearly than ever that it was the Nicene Creed which nerved and pointed my prayers

in the sick-rooms of that poor little district in Shrewsbury and in the Salop Infirmary of which I was joint Chaplain with my fellow curate, the present Bishop of Derby. It was the same, of course, during the three years at Lichfield, but it was not until I plunged into East London, on January 1, 1889, that I saw the difference between a clean-cut faith in the Incarnation and vague philanthropy.

At the Oxford House.—Oxford House was founded avowedly on the Nicene faith, and I am certain that it was the secret of its success. It was one of the earliest members of it, now a prominent statesman in the House of Lords, who said to me: "Of course, if Oxford House was not definitely Christian, I should have nothing to do with it." We went up in numbers from 3 to 30 because men who were going to be ordained found a clear and definite faith being taught and practised in a simple way at Oxford House, and the laymen who joined in the work, while they often took little part in the definite Christian teaching—for instance, in the surrounding Sunday Schools—liked to feel that their efforts centred round a chapel where the Nicene Creed was recited at every celebration of the Holy Communion.

Open-Air Work.—Among other ventures we undertook during these nine years in Bethnal Green was open-air speaking in the great Park, called Victoria Park, in East London, and here I found the Nicene Creed a great rallying-point for Christian effort. I think it is quite possible that many of my Nonconformist friends who so nobly rallied round me Sunday by Sunday had never read, and some of them had never heard of, the Nicene Creed, but at the same time it was the basis of our joint effort. I did not in the Park naturally stress the consequences which would evidently result from a belief in the Incarnation, such as Confirmation and the Sacramental system of the Church, although it was my happy fortune to present for Confirmation many Nonconformists during those years, and also some of the crowd who were influenced by what was said; but the great truth enshrined in the Creed was the subject of my discourses Sunday by Sunday, and what is not generally known is *what the crowd want to believe, if they can.*

I remember so well one afternoon in attempting, as I always did, to be fair to my opponents, that I said: "Well, now—I admit——" "Admit nothing," shouted a friendly voice from the crowd, and this is typical of their attitude generally. They always wanted you to "do in" the atheistic lecturer, if you could. I found the British Museum a very useful card to play in those days when any quotation from Tacitus or Josephus

was challenged; the answer was always ready, "Very well, then, we will refer it to the British Museum, and I will let you know next Sunday"; and it is a compliment to that institution to say that through all the controversy of the Park its authority was never challenged.

As Canon of St. Paul's.—When after nine years in East London I was called to take charge, as Bishop, of the East London district, and to be at the same time Canon of St. Paul's, I came into the privilege of hearing the Nicene Creed exquisitely sung every Sunday, though I am bound to say that in some of the most elaborate settings the Nicene Creed finds its greatest peril. There was a *mot* of Bishop Stubbs, still current at St. Paul's, which he may or may not have uttered; addressing Sir George Martin (as he was afterwards), Canon Stubbs is said to have uttered these words: "If that Creed had gone on any longer, Martin, I should not have believed anything." Beautiful as I myself found many settings of the Creed, we must never forget that it is a great battle-cry to be shouted as a host goes into action, and is not merely the theme for an elaborate composition.

As Bishop of London.—But, of course, as Bishop of East London during those three and a half years, and also during the last twenty-four as Bishop of London, the Creed has been the mainstay of all the work I have undertaken, for as a matter of fact the work of any Bishop in a great city like this is one perpetual Mission.

Take, for instance, such a Confirmation as the one in East London from which I have returned to-night. What sense has there been in anything I have done to-night unless the Nicene Creed is true? What is Baptism unless Jesus Christ Himself stands by the font and says, "Suffer the little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not." What is Confirmation unless He stands behind the Bishop's chair, breathes on the candidates, and says, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost!" What is even the Holy Communion unless Jesus Christ really stands by the altar rails and says in effect:

> "Here is the Bread of Life for you to eat!
> And here for you the Wine of Love to drink!"

That is the substance of what I have been saying to the candidates to-night, and the truth of all this is safeguarded and brought down to us by the Nicene Creed. I think we hardly realize how easy it is for great doctrines to have a "down-grade" tendency and even to get whittled away altogether without creeds, and we ought, in the Catholic Church, to be everlastingly grateful to those who framed them.

Difficulties of the Creed in Mission Work.—On the other hand, one must truthfully say that the Creed in action does present certain difficulties in Mission work. I was reading Canon Storr's interesting book this week entitled *The Living God*, and I quite agree with him that a great number of Christian people practically believe in three Gods. It is quite easy to point out in answer to a Mission question, as I did this week, that at the Baptism of our Lord, when He was in the water, the Father spoke and said, "This is My Beloved Son," and the Holy Ghost descended in bodily form as a Dove. It is easy to say that Jesus Christ said that it was expedient for His disciples that He should go away to enable the Comforter to come, and that He would pray the Father and He would give them another Comforter to abide with them for ever; in other words, it is easy to show a popular audience that the Doctrine of the Trinity is borne out by the Bible; but what it is hard to do is to give any intelligible view of the relationship of the Three Persons to one another, which really convinces people that there is only *one* God.

That is one reason why I have chosen *The Spirit of Jesus* as the subject of this year's Mission. The phrase has been restored in the Revised Version of Acts xvi. 7. The value of it is that it gives a really intelligible view, say to a Public School boy, of what gift he is to receive in his Confirmation. If the Holy Spirit comes from the Father through the Son (really a more accurate description than from the Father *and* the Son), then He brings with Him all the strength, purity, and charm of Jesus Christ Himself—this does give a perfectly intelligible view of the connexion between the Second and Third Person of the Trinity. So again the Holy Spirit cries Abba, Father! in men's hearts—that is, as I understand it, He gives a real sense of the Fatherhood of God. There again one gets an intelligible connection between the First and Third Persons of the Holy Trinity. But if I may venture to stray outside my province, and certainly out of my depth, I would venture to say that while we retain that word "Person" in the Athanasian Hymn, we shall always have this difficulty, and our leading theologians to-day might put their heads together to see if now it is not possible to use another expression.

But after all, this failing, if it is a failing, is not the fault of the Nicene Creed, and the framers of it have long lived down the sneer that they were fighting about a diphthong; for it is clearer to-day than ever that the expression, "*of one substance* with the Father" is absolutely essential to secure a belief in the Godhead of the Son.

Unless He was truly God, then there is no answer to the

suffering of the world, for in that case God did not suffer, and there is no salvation from the sin of the world, for only God can save. I write this simply as a working missioner to bear witness to the great help the Creed has been to me during forty years of Mission work, and to plead that we join with the Easterns in commemorating the 1,600th anniversary of the Creed which has been found to be such a boon and blessing to the Church.

A. F. LONDON.

THE FAITH OF THE INCARNATION*

1 St. John iii. 1: "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called children of God."

A PREACHER before the University in this year of grace 1925, when the whole Christian Church, East and West, will be celebrating the sixteenth centenary of the First Council of Nicea, need offer no excuse if he makes the work of that great Assembly in one way or another the theme of his address: nor need he fear, in approaching a subject so many-sided and so fertile of issues both immediate and more remote, that he will be either repeating or anticipating the message of others more entitled than himself to speak upon it. Rather, his fear will be of that more searching and intimate kind which the thought of the most sacred and central truths of the Gospel lays upon the heart—the fear lest he be found a false and unworthy steward of the Divine mysteries, a vain prophet of the God whose revelation he seeks to proclaim, a poor stripling of a soldier on a battlefield which the blood of martyrs has imbrued. Nevertheless, the Nicene faith sounds a trumpet-call which none can ignore, and rouses the Church to a warfare in which there are no discharges. It compels us to be either for it or against it; and those who are enlisted under its banner must needs set forth its cause with such powers as they can muster.

And what is this faith? Essentially and fundamentally it is a revelation, a Gospel, a doctrine of *God*. It is a doctrine of God rather than of Jesus: a doctrine of Jesus only because upon that, as matters stood, hung the issue of Christian monotheism. It was the Christian conception of God—His triune nature, and the Unity even more than the Trinity; His transcendence; His relation to the world of history and becoming—this was what gave and gives to the controversy at Nicea its classical signifi-

* A Sermon preached before the University of Oxford on the Fourth Sunday after Easter, May 10, 1925.

cance in the annals of Christendom. The historian may smile that such passions should surge around a mere iota. And yet we did not smile ten years ago when we read of armed hosts of men surging around Hill 60 on the Flanders border. We did not smile because, though we knew that Hill 60 was no hill at all but merely a low rising of the ground, yet that was where England was meeting Germany and where brave men were dying. So with the iota. Athanasius might be defending the very term which earlier he had repudiated, and denouncing that which once he had approved. But, as things had fallen out, the iota had become now the symbol of forces ranged for battle in a life-and-death struggle. Its acceptance by the Church would have meant the surrender of that whole revelation of God which patriarchs, lawgivers, and prophets had transmitted and purified and which had shone out in its full and final splendour in the Person of Jesus Christ. Its rejection meant that the Scripture could still be read entire; that the rich and yet uncompromising monotheism which Christianity had taken over from the Jews was still its peculiar possession; and that the secret of God's dealings with the world—that *crux* of all philosophy—lay in the mediation of a Person. Hill 60 only becomes intelligible when set in its place in the long line that stretched from the Alps to the sea. Just so the *homo-usios* needs to be envisaged as part of the whole Creed before its tremendous meaning can be appraised.

The form of the Nicene Creed, whether we take the actual symbol adopted by the Council or the later and developed form of it which by a convenient error has since usurped the name, bears clear witness to the fact that its main burden is a doctrine of God. Its three sections correspond plainly to that confession of the threefold Name of God which had been required from the earliest times of those who offered themselves for admission by baptism into the Christian Church; and the fact is all the more significant when we remember that the Nicene Creed differed from its predecessors in being intended, not for catechumens as a means of instruction, but for bishops as a test of orthodoxy. We can apply to it, in fact, the same interpretation as our Catechism employs for the Apostles' Creed, where the three lessons which we learn from it are all designated as lessons of belief in God. Indeed, the Nicene Creed underlines this emphasis. It is a very striking fact that of the second section—that which is concerned with the historical element in the Gospel—more than half is devoted to the heavenly and pre-incarnate Life of the Son, to His relations within the Godhead, and to His cosmical functions; as though the Church would insist that we cannot hope to know the Jesus of history until

we have first been to school with the Christ of faith. And it is safe to say that, had the Arian formula triumphed, this could not have been so. The unity of the Creed, which testifies throughout to the one God in three Persons, would have contained a rift bound sooner or later to bring the whole structure down, while men oscillated between a belief in God indistinguishable from Deism and a belief in Jesus only justifiable by Pantheism.

Deism and Pantheism—these are the two poles towards which human opinion seems inevitably to gravitate when it loses hold of the dogma of the Incarnation. They represent the *ultima ratio* of reactions from real difficulties which every thoughtful believer is bound to experience in the development of his own mind and to face with courage. There is first the question whether we can believe in God as One who intervenes in history, as it were *ab extra*, in the way which Christian orthodoxy seems to necessitate. Does not this whole idea of an intrusive act of God militate against those evolutionary conceptions of history which we have learned from modern science? And if those evolutionary conceptions give, indeed, a complete account of the matter, the question admits of no reply. But Christianity cannot for a moment admit the premise. We are pledged to a view of history in which the conception has, indeed, its place, but only as an interpretation of a portion of the facts. We are pledged to it by our acceptance of the Scriptures. For the Scriptures show us history, not as the mere development of immanental principles and forces, but as a stage on which, at sundry times, and in divers manners, God enters to reveal, to guide, to save, and to destroy. History is on this view the scene of His judgments, events the footprints of His passing, man the subject of His repeated warnings and solicitations. He who sent His only Son is the same who also sent the prophets, who delivered Israel out of Egypt, and made the heathen Cyrus His anointed. At every point in the long Bible story we have to reckon with the transcendent action of God in human affairs; so that to those who are steeped in its way of thought the mere fact that the Incarnation represents a Divine intervention in history presents not so much a problem as an explanation.

But we may—indeed, we must—go further. The Bible is concerned with a part only—and quantitatively a very small part—of human history; and every year adds to our knowledge of vast tracts of history prior to and outside of that fragment. Are we to leave the Biblical record as a kind of surd in our estimate of universal history? Or are we to scale it down until it conforms to canons applicable to history as a whole? Or is there some third way? Certainly the Church claims that there is. And it will base its claim upon a principle—upon the

principle that the deepest and truest judgments we can form of history are qualitative and not quantitative. It will insist that a mere expansion of historical *data* proves nothing: what matters is its worth and wealth in excellence or good. And on that basis it joins issue with confidence. It claims that, whatever criterion of excellence be adopted, the age when Christ was born presents all the credentials of an age of supreme crisis and climax, and deserves the title of " the fulness of the times."

" The fulness of the times "—there is, I know, a traditional interpretation of this phrase which finds its primary meaning in the peculiar extremity of wickedness reached by human society at this time. I confess that I do not know how a sweeping moral judgment of this kind is either arrived at or substantiated. But if we look to human excellence rather than human sin, then I think we can find in certain well-established judgments of mankind some important factors which point to the age of the Incarnation as a unique moment in human affairs. I mean this—that there does not seem to be a single characteristic activity of civilized mankind which had not reached before the Incarnation a level of formal or typical excellence which future generations have agreed to regard as classical and which has, in a qualitative sense, never been surpassed. We think of the labours of the discursive reason, and we recall Plato and Aristotle; we think of the genius of the artist, and name Phidias and Praxiteles, or of the poet, and name Homer and Sophocles and Lucretius; we turn to men of action, and are dazzled by the strategy of an Alexander or a Cæsar; we consider the prowess of the athlete, and rejoice in the feats immortalized by Pindar; we reflect on the art of government, and are lost in wonder at Imperial Rome. Finally, we seek for that wisdom and holiness which denote the fellowship of God; and from the pages of the Old Testament there shine out upon us the fidelity of Moses, the modesty of Ruth, the penitence of David, the truthfulness of Jeremiah, and at the close of this succession, when the page of the New Testament has been already turned, the gracious and humble faith of Mary, the Mother of the Lord. We need not wonder if the ear of a Virgil should catch some secret whisper in the air telling him that the times were ripe for the inauguration of a new age in human history. It was such a moment as called for an act of God.

But there remains our second question. Granted that our historical sense is not offended by some Divine intervention at this juncture if at any, can we believe that it could be so unique in kind as the dogma of the Incarnation requires? Can we believe that

" God's Presence and His very Self
And Essence all Divine "

could move amongst men on earth in human soul and body? Could God so change His relation to the world and to man as to become, at a point in time and in a particular human life, incarnate? That is, I take it, the difficulty; it seems inconsistent with the very notion of God as changeless, eternal, infinite. We seem to be using the language of myth rather than of reality.

And from one point of view we are, no doubt, using the language of myth. When we say that the eternal Son of God "came down from heaven" we are trying to express in words drawn from human experience an act of God which of necessity baffles our understanding. And that, as Plato taught us, is to use the language of myth, and to use it rightly. Regarded as an act of God, the Incarnation admits of no other language. But the Incarnation is not only an act of God; it is also a fact of God. It is curious that while for the historian the Incarnation as an act of God only loses its incredibility when it is attributed to One whose characteristic it is to act frequently in human history, the theologian can only come to terms with it as a fact of God if it be confessed to be unparalleled and unique. It has the uniqueness and the singularity attaching to the keystone of an arch: it is, in fact, the keystone of the structure of Reality as Christian thought conceives it. Therein we see revealed the abiding mystery of God's relation to the world; we see that it consists in the mediation of a Person, "in whom all things have their coherence" and "through whom" they came into being. It is Jesus, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. Not "the divinity of Christ," but rather "the Word made flesh" sums up its significance. It is the ground of whatever fellowship with God men have been admitted to whether before it or after it, as men count time—of those dimmer degrees of it which we can trace in Judaism and even in paganism no less than of that abiding union which is the prerogative of the Christian. In short, the Incarnation is a fact which only yields its secret when it is regarded *sub specie aeternitatis*.

Once more: this same fact of the Word made flesh in Jesus, which conditions the inherence of the believer in God, is at the same time the great revelation of the Father. It is that, because the Revealer is Himself of the transcendent. He comes from God, as well as goes to God. As God He knows the Father, and so as Man can reveal Him. He belongs to that "wholly Other" One whose ways are not as our ways, nor His thoughts as our thoughts; and the knowledge and the status that He imparts to us are those which He had with the Father before the world was. It is this which Origen and his disciples strove to safeguard in such a phrase as "the eternal generation" or (more boldly) the "subordination" of the Son. The balance of the

doctrine of the Incarnation requires that we should not shrink from that aspect of the truth, nor hesitate to confess that there is that in the intrinsic relations of the Godhead which corresponds to the act wherein the Son made Himself of no account and became Man. He is not created—but He is begotten: He is God—but He is "God *of* God, Light *of* Light": through Him were all things made—but He is the Mediator, not the Fountain-head, of Creation as of Redemption. And so too with Revelation: He came not to seek His own glory, but to reveal the Father and the Father's will. No more than the Liturgy does the Creed allow us to conclude our worship without lifting up the heart to the Father who with the Son and the Holy Ghost is the final end and term of our adoration.

And how momentous is this revelation! How unique and without parallel in human thought! Left to ourselves, we could not figure the transcendent God as other than a veiled and distant Being, Unknowable and Unknown. If we know Him as Father, it is because the transcendent Son has become incarnate and by the outpouring of His spirit is made immanent in our experience, thus enfranchising us with His own Sonship. There is a story told of a missionary in India who was translating the First Epistle of St. John with the help of his Brahmin teacher. He asked the Indian to translate the first verse of the third chapter, and, when the latter brought it, noticed that it was changed. "Surely," he said, "you have not translated it rightly." "No, Sahib," he answered, "I have changed it": and added, "Sahib, what the book says cannot possibly be true—'children of God'—that cannot be true. I have put there what may be true. . . . 'Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us that we should be permitted to kiss His feet.'" That is what the revelation of God in Christ must mean to one who cannot conceive of the Revealer except as the supreme example of immanent Divinity. The Christ of Pantheism can show us no more than the Father's feet: it is the Christ of the Gospel and He only who can show us His face. And He can show it us because He Himself has seen it by the Father's throne. That is the Faith of the Council of Nicea.

E. G. Selwyn.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE Bishop of Gibraltar's third article on The Orthodox Churches is held over until next month in order to allow the whole article space in this issue to be devoted to matters Nicene.

We have received a copy of an Indian Christian weekly, *The Guardian*, published in Calcutta, and now in its third year. It is edited by A. N. Sudarisanam. The following paragraph from the Presidential address of Dr. J. R. Chitambar at the All-India Conference of Indian Christians may be of interest to our readers. Speaking of the Hindu-Moslem riots, he said:

"So far as I know the Indian Christians have not taken sides anywhere. Whatever be the opinion of individuals, the community has not only stood neutral, but has also offered, and actually rendered, services alike to the two communities. In Lucknow, the Indian Christians, encouraged and assisted by missionaries, rendered invaluable help to both our Hindu and Mohamedan brothers. We repudiate the charge that our community is for one or the other party. We are for peace, and our position is that of a mediator between the two parties. We are grateful to the leaders of our Hindu and Moslem brothers for receiving our representatives with the greatest possible courtesy and cordiality, and for sympathetically listening to what they had to say in the matter."

We are glad to draw attention to *A "Model" Service of Holy Communion*, being suggestions as to a revised Liturgy drawn up by the Rev. F. Douglas Robinson, M.A., Vicar of Egerton. We hope that it will receive consideration, both as to substance and to form. The text of the service is printed on the left-hand pages only, while matter for occasional use only is printed on the right-hand pages. The result is an undoubted gain in simplicity. The brochure is to be obtained from Egerton Vicarage, Ashford, Kent.

The Rev. H. Fulford Williams writes from Kasauli, Punjab, India:

"Hagiology is an interesting subject. A curious development of it at present being worked out in the city of Calcutta may interest readers of THEOLOGY as throwing some light on the development of the cult of a saint.

"Some years ago a Madrassi Christian was convicted of manslaughter, and sentenced to transportation to the Andaman Islands. After serving some years of his sentence he was released—in connection with the Jubilee of 1897—and then he came to Calcutta. For many years he begged outside the butchers' stalls of the Sturat Hogg Market, Calcutta. Not knowing Urdu or Hindi, he did not speak, and so gained a reputation for sanctity among the butchers, who are a fanatical Moslem body. He died at his pitch last September, and the butchers proclaimed him a 'pir,' or saint, and buried him outside the market in the street.

"This enraged the Hindus, as thereby the entrance to the market over his grave was made unclean. Objection was raised also at the violation of the bye-laws of the Council about burials inside the municipal limits.

"Educated Moslem opinion has been divided on the point, some holding that such worship is opposed to the true spirit of Islam, others that the butchers are entitled to a local saint if they want one; but the character of the particular saint is suspicious.

"After considerable delay—in which time a shrine has been erected in defiance of the Council and its bylaws—an order has just been passed for the removal of the 'saint' to a spot outside the market.

"The whole incident is interesting as illustrating communal feeling in India at the present moment, as well as municipal government as worked under Indian conditions, but it is also interesting, as I remarked above, as illustrating the development of a cultus."

AN UNPUBLISHED LETTER OF FATHER BENSON'S

Cowley St. John,
June 17, 1887.

Dear Mr. Butler,

I think one can only condemn betting, etc., upon the rule of doing to our neighbour what we would they should do to us, and loving our neighbour as ourself.

If we would keep this law, we cannot wish to enrich ourselves at our neighbour's cost. Whatever we gain by gambling, our neighbour loses. How, then, can we rejoice? I see no harm in the loser paying for the tables. That is not a matter of sufficient amount to be felt, unless there were some fraudulent pretence. Two players would be naturally fairly matched; otherwise it is an absurdity their playing together. Even the smallest points may be a matter of consequence to one of the players, although not to the other. Even with persons well to do, a small sum may at times be a matter of consideration. Small sums won go on multiplying, and gamblers get themselves involved in large losses before they are aware, especially the inexperienced. The practised gambler trades upon the inexperience of the other. Pride encourages people not to stop as if they felt the loss, and vain hope backs up the pride with the suggestion of possibly winning after all.

There is, however, a deeper principle. The love of money is the root of all evil; yes, even in proper business—much more in gambling. We must not make haste to be rich. Our prayer is for daily bread, nothing more. Nothing is a real gain to us which comes to us without being *earned*. Our duty is to learn and labour truly to get our own living. What we snatch at hastily as a mere piece of luck is a harm to us, and not a real gain. Gambling, of course, sets aside this view of our relation to external goods. If a man inherits a position of wealth by God's Providence, he may look for God to give grace proportionately, provided always that he himself acts up to his responsibilities; but gambling ignores responsibilities, and represents the money as being a good thing anyhow. The principle is the same in the smallest matter, although perhaps we do not recognize the idea of responsibility except in greater matters.

Everyone ought to recognize the responsibility of wealth. The true Christian goes beyond this, or, rather carries this teaching back to its elementary principles, works it out to its logical consequences—and thus he comes to accept the words of our Lord: Blessed are the poor in Spirit.

A man who is eager for money, whether for £10,000 a year or for 6d., cannot be poor in spirit. He cannot, therefore, set a right estimate upon the two worlds.

A religiously minded man who believes what our Lord did not deny, that the wealth of this world is given by Satan to whomsoever he pleases, must feel that if he is successful in games of chance, winning, not earning, money, obtaining it not by prayer nor by labour, but simply in sportive gratification of his lower desires, he is most probably receiving it from Satan immediately without any hallowing safeguard. This would go against such forms of gambling as a State lottery, which might seem to be untouched by any principle of charity. No one is harmed by losing, but probably the winner is harmed, for he has no reason to expect a blessing on such gain.

I am,
Yours very truly,
R. H. Benson.

THE CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY

The first volume of this new enterprise was published two years ago. When the series is completed we shall have before us one of the greatest successes yet achieved, a complete account of European peoples from pre-historical beginnings to the present day. The Ancient History will bring us down to 324 A.D.; then the Mediæval History, of which three volumes have appeared so far, will take up the story; while the Modern History, long ago finished, succeeds the Mediæval at the Renascence.

The present volume deals with Egypt and Babylonia down to 1580 B.C. In the next, so we read in the preface, "the curtain will rise upon Old Testament history." Theologians will find the second of great interest. Meanwhile a few notes upon the first volume, which in the main lies outside our province, may be helpful.

One paragraph in Professor Myres' brilliant account of primitive man throws light on the Flood story. The end of the last glacial period came suddenly in Asia Minor and Mesopotamia, as one would expect so far south, and the rivers fed by the melting snows became overwhelming torrents. "The disastrous effect of this diluvial phase was to eliminate Mesopotamia as a focus of post-glacial culture, and to postpone effective occupation till an alluvial area had been created beyond it" (p. 44).

Dr. S. A. Cook's articles on the Semites are full of interest. The identification of Amraphel with Hammurabi (Gen. xiv.) is probably to be accepted (p. 154). The Israelites were in a relatively simple state when they entered Canaan, comparable to that of the Arabs before the days of Islam (p. 157). The inference is that we must not transfer to them ideas of civilization won from a study of Egypt and Babylonia. The Semites as a whole are not religiously minded, though by a paradox they have given the world religious geniuses. (This is the view of the Old Testament, which by no means bears out the facile generalization that the Jew had a genius for religion.) "The Semites breed men of tremendous personality, men who hold the world within them and feel themselves anyone's equal. Impetuous and imperious, they rush at difficulties; and, although they are normally unadventurous, they outstrip, when aroused, their racial rivals, but rarely leave heirs" (p. 197). On the same page

Dr. Cook advances an eirenicon as between the polytheistic and monotheistic interpretations of early Hebrew records. "In their broad outlines all the Semitic religions are the natural expression of the Semitic temper and modes of thought. Characteristic are the simplicity, directness, exclusiveness, and intensity which give them a seeming monotheistic trend. . . . There is a vast difference between a psychological monotheism (as where the god filled the entire emotional life of his worshipper) and one that is metaphysical and involves theoretical problems of causation which, needless to say, the Semites did not consider." The narratives of Genesis are often the reflection of historical facts. But the truth of one assertion must not be used as an argument in favour of another. "It is often difficult to determine whether Assyrian or Neo-Babylonian texts represent current thought (seventh to fifth century B.C.), or that of the twenty-first century B.C. and earlier." Cf. Israelite history in the times of Ezra and Moses (p. 221).

Professor Peet, writing on Egypt, will not see any otherworldliness in the ancient Egyptians. The dead man was supposed to survive literally within his tomb. But real prophetic thought and Messianic expectation are found among the Egyptians nearly 1,000 years before we find them in the Old Testament. The ferocious punishments of the Code of Hammurabi are not corroborated by the actual documents reflecting daily life in that monarch's time. We must look upon them as traditional punishments which were once enforced literally, but had become obsolete. They were retained as showing the *maximum* penalty that could be inflicted. Was the same true of the Law of Moses?

Though it has no theological bearing, we cannot forbear to quote the origin of the Chinese and Japanese characteristics as given by Professor Myres. For countless years the primitive Mongolian roamed in the sandy deserts of Central Asia; hence his yellow skin by way of protective colouring. His staple food was mare's milk, sucked from the udder; hence his wide apart eyes and flattened nose.

W. K. L. C.

REVIEW

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. By James Moffatt, D.D., D.Litt., Hon. M.A. (Oxon.). Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1924. 14s.

Dr. Moffatt was well prepared for this commentary. In 1900 he wrote one of the most delectable books about the New Testament that ever was written, *The Historical New Testament.* It is a companion to the student which he uses gratefully for its lists and tables and the like convenient material while he never wearies of its fresh fancy; a young man's book—yet a most learned youth—which keeps us young. Hebrews is not the least attractive chapter in this book. One of the quotations which enliven it is worth notice as a finger post in approaching the new commentary, this namely from James Smetham's *Letters:*

> "Is there a Christ? Is He the Heir of all things? Was He made flesh? Did He offer the all-perfect sacrifice? Did He supersede the old order of priests? Is He the mediator of a new and better Covenant? What are the terms of that Covenant? There are no questions like these. . . . I am astonished at the imperative tone of this Epistle, and the element of holy scorn against those who refuse to go into these great questions carefully."

Notice the intense theological interest here, and the lack of interest in circumstance.

Then, in 1911, the *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* was published. The freshness fades, good sense prevails, the erudition is marshalled with more explanation. The *Introduction* is not such good company as *H.N.T.* but it is more solid; and Hebrews wins way to a simpler, more essential treatment than had hitherto been usual.

H.N.T. contained a new version of the New Testament. This has been almost forgotten since Dr. Moffatt's later version captivated the mind of the people. Perhaps the earlier was better. The later seems redolent of the papyri and their bourgeoisity, which is so different from the rudeness or the grace of the apostolic writers. The later version of Hebrews is embodied in the *Commentary.* Here the earlier was traditional and grander. The later explains more precisely, and precision sometimes contracts the breadth of the author's intention. The comparison is of great interest throughout: two well-known passages and a few notes must suffice here:

Now faith is to be confident of what we hope for, to be convinced of what we do not see.
It was in this that witness was borne to the men of old.
By faith we understand that the worlds have been fashioned by the word of God,
So that what is visible has not been made out of things that appear. *H.N.T.*

Now faith means we are confident of what we hope for, convinced of what we do not see. It was for this that the men of old won their record. It is by faith we understand that the world was fashioned by the word of God, and thus the visible was made out of the invisible.—*Commentary.*

The stichometry of *H.N.T.* is a help to the rhythm of Hebrews. "Means" excludes formal definition. "Witness was borne," "won their record": which comes nearest to the incipient idea of martyrdom? The last clause in *H.N.T.* does, in *Commentary* does not allow the apparent subtlety in the perfect infinitive and the whole conception is consequently cramped.

In the next verse "He died, but by his faith he is speaking to us still" improves upon "And thereby he still speaks to us in death," for the faithful die but are not dead. A little further on the alteration of "pilgrims" to "exiles" is unfortunate and almost suggests what is false.

In ix 14 "the spirit of the eternal" is a piece of worthy interpretation: would the obviously abstract "eternity" be still more serviceable?

Lastly let us hear the opening of the epistle, and vote for either version according to taste:

"Many were the forms and fashions in which God spoke of old to our fathers by the prophets, but in these days at the end he has spoken to us by a Son—a Son whom he has appointed heir of the universe, as it was by him that he created the world."—*Commentary.*

"After speaking to the fathers long ago by fragments and forms manifold in the prophets, God spoke to us at the end of these days in a Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, through whom also he made the worlds."—*H.N.T.*

Dr. Moffatt treats the text of the epistle with masterful simplicity; and his mastery is learned. He makes his own text as he goes on. He does not ignore von Soden or ("as the manner of some is") misunderstand Hort. But he is not much interested in the theory of textual criticism. His estimate of

MSS., singly or in groups, is their witnessing to what he decrees to be the right reading; and this right reading is that which fits the theology of the epistle and needs no far-fetched, or as some might plead delicate exegesis. No "neutral text" binds his conscience. In such a verse as xiii 21, where documentary authority for "us" in the second clause is overwhelming, he can quote the plain evidence and set it aside with "merely an error." The variation is more important than it seems at first sight. If the epistle abounds in sentences and phrases which indicate an intense and definite situation; if some one hard duty lies before its readers from which as yet they shrink; if the main purpose of the writer is to persuade his friends to do this duty; if he believes they would wish to do it did they understand the full doctrine of their Lord's person and work, while such full understanding would bring them divine strength to face the trial: if all this be fact, and some have read the epistle and judged it so to be, then the antithesis of "you" and "us" is necessary in this final collect-like blessing: "may you, who are still hesitating, have strength to do your immediate duty: for us, who have sacrificed our private will and are already in the peace of God, I ask no special boon, only continuance of God's good pleasure." We see the author on his knees, we read his MS. in archetype. In later days, in everyday church reading, this particularity of origin was generalized: so in the *Benedictus* "the dayspring hath visited us" took the place of "the dayspring shall visit us" of Zacharias' pre-Christmas hymn.

Dr. Moffatt does not recognize any such one hard duty before the first readers. Some have thought it might be the duty of breaking with their ancestral Jewish Church, when the war with Rome was preparing and all men of Jewish birth were summoned to fight for hearth and temple and (as Christians held) a false messianism. That is out of the question for Dr. Moffatt, since he finds no Jewish colour in the epistle at all. If any choice must be made, it was addressed rather to Gentile readers. But choice may be passed by. The times are late. Interests have changed. None think now of the old division between Jew and Gentile in the Church. All that can be defined is this:—Some one whose name cannot be recovered, himself "perhaps a Jewish Christian, who had imbibed the philosophy of Alexandrian Judaism before his conversion, a man of literary culture and deep religious feeling, writes to a small circle of Christians to which he was attached. . . . They belonged to Italy . . . have lived through some rough experiences . . . their original leaders have died, probably as martyrs. For these and other reasons, a certain sense of disillusionment had begun to creep over them." The epistle

is a Word of Consolation " to steady and rally people who are being tempted, their temptation being to renounce God, or at least to hesitate and retreat, to relax the fibre of loyal faith, as if God were too difficult to follow in the new hard situation. . . . They had borne manfully, in the first glow of their enthusiasm. Now, the more violent forms of persecution had apparently passed; what was left was the dragging experience of contempt at the hand of outsiders, the social ostracism and shame, which were threatening to take the heart out of them. Such was their rough, disconcerting environment."

Thus Alan Fairford lifts away the *integumenta* of our Peter Peebles' case. We can but applaud when we follow him to what he discovers as the heart of the matter. For indeed the old repeated criticism of Hebrews has long been little more than repeated guesswork; Dr. Moffatt strikes at once into grand theology.

" The flow of thought, with its turns and windings, is best followed from point to point. So far as the general plan goes, it is determined by the idea of the finality of the Christian revelation in Jesus the Son of God. . . . The Personality of the Son is discussed. Next comes the Son as High Priest. . . . The Sacrifice of this High Priest in his Sanctuary then is discussed, each of the three arguments, which are vitally connected, laying stress from one side or another upon the absolute efficacy of the revelation. This is the dominant idea of the writing, and it explains the particular line which the writer strikes out. He takes a very serious view of the position of his friends. . . . The only way to save them is to put before them the fearful and unsuspected consequences of their failure. . . . He offers no theoretical disquisition; it is to reinforce and deepen their conviction of the place of Jesus in religion that he argues, pleads, and warns, dwelling on the privileges and responsibilities of the relationship in which Jesus had placed them. All the help they needed, all the hope they required, lay in the access to God mediated by Jesus, if they would only realize it."

" What he writes is not a theological treatise in cold blood, but a statement of the faith, alive with practical interest. The situation of his readers has stirred his own mind and he bends all his powers of thought and emotion to rally them."

It is evident that Dr. Moffatt's refusal to envisage a conjectural history has not spoiled the intensity of the epistle. But he is left free to bend all his powers on the theology. Large selection from his own words will most satisfactorily display his penetrating, single view.

> " The philosophical element in his view of the world and God is fundamentally Platonic. . . . The phenomenal

> is but an imperfect, shadowy transcript of what is eternal and real. . . . Thus faith means the conviction, the practical realization, of this world of realities, the conviction that life must be ordered, at all costs, by a vision of the Unseen, or by obedience to a Voice unheard by any outward ear. . . . There is an archetypal order of things, eternal and divine, to which the mundane order but dimly corresponds, and only within this higher order, eternal and invisible, is access to God possible to man. . . . For our author it is a sanctuary, the real Presence of God, and it is entered not through ecstasy, or mystic rapture, but through connexion with Jesus Christ, who has not only revealed that world, but opened the way into it. . . . The full bliss of the fellowship is still in the future; indeed it is not to be realized finally until Jesus returns for his people, for he is as yet only their forerunner. The primitive eschatology required and received this admission from the writer, though it is hardly consonant with his deeper thought. . . . But while this note of expectation is sounded now and then, it is held that Christians already experience the powers of the world to come. The new and final order has dawned ever since the sacrifice of Jesus was made, and the position of believers is guaranteed. . . . Christians enjoy the final status of relationship to God in the world of spirit and reality, in virtue of the final sacrifice offered by Jesus the Son."

But what is sacrifice? The term, the picture, belongs to that symbolic character which marks the fancy of this most artist-like philosopher. And picture-thinking has inconveniences. Yet "the concentration of this writer's interest in the symbol on the sole personality of the priest and of the single sacrifice enabled him to voice what was his predominant idea about Jesus. . . . Because Jesus was what he was, his death has such an atoning significance as to inaugurate a new and final relation between God and men, his blood purifies the conscience because it is *his* blood, the blood of the sinless Christ, who is both the priest and the sacrifice. . . . The sacrifice of Christ never needed to be repeated, because it had been offered in the spirit and—as we might say—in the eternal order of things. It was a sacrifice bound up with his death in history, but it belonged essentially to the higher order of absolute reality. The writer breathed the Philonic atmosphere in which the eternal Now overshadowed the things of space and time, but he knew this sacrifice had taken place on the cross, and his problem was one which never confronted Philo, the problem

which we moderns have to face in the question: How can a single historical fact possess a timeless significance? How can Christianity claim to be final, on the basis of a specific revelation in history? Our author answered this problem in his own way for his own day."

His answer is shaped by his own conception of religion as worship, as being in God's Presence, as "fellowship with God on the basis of forgiveness." Without forgiveness, no access; and forgiveness requires that act of God and man which "sacrifice" expresses. That act has been performed by Jesus Christ who is eternal Son of God and became High Priest to God for man by passing through a perfectly human life on earth, sacrificing his very self even to death on the cross. That is the sacrifice, and all men can use it, each as his own, according to a beautiful saying of Philo which Dr. Moffatt quotes: "Two temples belong to God, one being in the world in which the high priest is his own Son, the Logos, the other being the rational soul." Beautiful too is Dr. Moffatt's summary of his author's "sacrificial delineation of the Christian life. In this 'true tabernacle' of God's own making, with its 'altar of incense' Christians worship God; their devotion to him is expressed by the faith and loyalty which detach them from this world and enable them to live and move under the inspiration of the upper world; indeed their ethical life of thanksgiving and beneficence is a sacrifice by which they honour and worship God, a sacrifice presented to God by their High Priest Jesus."

Let one more quotation be allowed to clinch this running argument:

> "The blood or sacrificial death of Christ was required in order that human sin might be removed. Why such a sacrifice, why sacrifice at all was essential, he did not ask. It was commanded by God in the bible; that was sufficient for him. The vital point for him was that, under this category of sacrifice, the blood of Christ superseded all previous arrangements for securing pardon."

And, we are inclined to add on Dr. Moffatt's own sympathetic showing, a vital point is also the reasonableness of this one final all-superseding sacrifice. It is genuine platonic doctrine: all comes from goodness and runs out in goodness. That source of all which lies beyond the argument is eternal goodness; the perfecting of Jesus the High Priest was through the sinlessness of the days of his flesh; the sacrificial life of Christians is the imitation of their sinless Lord.

Thorough-going platonists are apt to chafe at the symbolic side of things, to revolt from all appearance of matter. Does the

author of this epistle do so in xiii 10? Some have found reference here to the Christian eucharist, and a protest "against the rising conception of the Lord's Supper as an eating of the body of the Christ." Dr. Moffatt partly agrees. He says:

> "Inwardness is the dominating thought of the entire paragraph. God's grace in Jesus Christ works upon the soul; no external medium like food is required to bring us into fellowship with him; it is vain to imagine that by eating anything one can enjoy communion with God. Our Lord stands wholly outside the material world of sense, outside things touched and tasted; in relationship to him and him alone we can worship God. The writer has a mystical and idealistic bent, to which the sacramental idea is foreign. He never alludes to the eucharist; the one sacrament he notices is baptism. A ritual meal as the means of strengthening communion with God through Christ does not appeal to him in the slightest degree. It is not thus that God's grace is experienced."

The verse would therefore mean: We Christians have an altar to which no ritual of eating belongs; not, We Christians have an altar in the food of which the ancient Jewish Church cannot partake. In the Christian liturgy all is pure spirit.

The idea arrests attention. It would represent a remarkable point in the series Luke-Hebrews-John. It seems like a glimpse of a current in primitive Christendom just before the general, effective Church made up its mind and swept away all wandering piety. But is it a glimpse or only a dream? "Our altar is one of which the worshippers have no right to eat," is Dr. Moffatt's new translation. Is not the earlier *H.N.T.* more honest, "We have an altar of which they have no right to eat who serve the tabernacle"? After all it is difficult to explain away that "tabernacle."

However, let us leave minute philosophy, and look the whole commentary in the face as we say farewell. We cannot but say it with profound respect. This is one of the half-dozen great commentaries of our day. It is worthy to be studied with meditation. It leads to still waters and refreshes the soul.

There are four moments in the history of the interpretation of Hebrews. The first was when Nestorius drew out its doctrine of the perfect manhood of the Lord. The next was when Bleek brought its general criticism into the daylight of modern learning. Then, in our own day, Westcott explained the true meaning of the symbolism of the blood. Now Dr. Moffatt explains its Christian platonism:—the epistle of the Sacred Manhood, of Atonement, of Eternal Spirit.

A. NAIRNE.

NOTICES

ROME AND THE EARLY CHURCH. By C. F. Rogers. S.P.C.K. 1s. 6d.

The author of this exceptionally useful little book justly states in his Introduction that the one real point at issue between Canterbury and Rome is the question of the papacy. This being so, it is extremely desirable to present the evidence upon which the Roman claims have to be judged in a form that is perfectly simple, perfectly brief, and as impartial as any statement can be which proceeds from a person whose own convictions are definitely formed already. The book is an admirable attempt to fulfil this need.

First of all, the proof texts upon which Papalists rely from Scripture are set out and examined; then the similar proof texts from the early Fathers are handled; then the evidence of the process of events in early centuries is in like manner expounded. The specially valuable features of the work are three. First, the crucial passages are collected and clearly translated with the necessary explanations of the attendant circumstances, so that their real meaning may be better estimated. Secondly, and more important still, the contexts are also translated, and the proof texts are not hurled like isolated thunderbolts at the stunned reader; they come orderly in the reasoned argument to which they belong, so that some judgment may be made of their intended bearing. Thirdly, Professor Rogers does not try to prove too much; he is not disproving the papal claims, but setting out the evidence commonly adduced for them, and indicating what various interpretations can legitimately be put upon it.

The upshot of this most sane and fair treatment is to suggest that (1) the evidence is indecisive for the papal claims, and (2) an equally reasonable view would be that the disputed claim of the Roman bishop to give personal orders grew out of the undoubted capacity of the early Roman Church to give corporate advice to other communities.

LEONARD PRESTIGE.

PISTIS SOPHIA. Literally translated from the Coptic by George Horner. With an Introduction by F. Legge, F.S.A. S.P.C.K. 16s.

The importance of the text of which the present work is a translation consists in this, that it gives us an account of the tenets of the Gnostics from the Gnostic side. These were, until the middle of the last century, known only from the statements of opponents. Irenæus, Tertullian, and other orthodox writers, not knowing Gnosticism from the inside, were inclined to lay stress on minor points, and by so doing to exaggerate the differences between the various Gnostic systems, and to minimize the amount of agreement between them on essential principles. Not yet has a century elapsed since we first obtained by the publication of the *Philosophumena* of Hippolytus in 1840 extracts from Gnostic writers long enough to give an idea of their method of writing. Ten years later (1851) the Coptic text underlying the present translation was first published as a whole. Previously interest had been drawn to the MS. by the publication (1812) of five of the " Odes of Solomon " which are quoted at length in it.

The Coptic text was, during the nineteenth century, translated into Latin (Schwartze), French (Amélineau), and English (Mead),

the two last-named merely giving translations of Schwartze's Latin version.

It is plain from the MS. itself that it contains, not a single work, but a series of extracts. These extracts were made, Mr. Legge supposes (p. xxv), for the information of the orthodox, possibly "for the enlightenment of some conciliar, episcopal, or even secular tribunal concerned in the suppression of heresy, such as the Inquisitors of the Faith set up by Theodosius."

Thus, then, though the title of our book is Pistis Sophia, it does not include the whole of the Gnostic work which bore that title, and it does contain much that is, at most, but indirectly related to it.

It is a matter of dispute from which of the Gnostic sects these extracts come. It seems hardly worth while to discuss this if, as Mr. Legge agrees, the essential principles of all were similar. At any rate, it is of much greater importance to note that the extracts, as Mr. Legge seems to prove clearly, are not on one and the same level. From the "fairly lofty standard of thought" of the first extract the others "show one long and successive degradation." His conclusion, therefore, is that, though all the documents belong to the School of Valentinus, only the two first are connected with Valentinus himself, while the others are "by degenerate successors of his School," and may be as late as the end of the fourth century.

The translation seems to us to be made on a wrong principle. It is said to be "literally translated." It is so slavishly literal that it is unreadable. Idioms cannot be translated word for word. Who, for example, would translate *per te stetit quominus vinceremus* by "through thee it stood by which the less we might conquer"? There is a similar reproduction of Coptic idiom in the present translation. The Coptic scholar will be able mentally to translate idiomatic, or at least grammatical, English into Coptic idiom; the ordinary reader, ignorant of Coptic, will resent such phrases as "he emanated out of him a great power of face of lion" (p. 23); "she prostrated at the feet of Jesus" (p. 17); "I enlightened greatly greatly" (p. 10). The grammar besides is incorrect; "emanate" is not a transitive verb, nor are the verbs "prostrate" and "enlighten" intransitive. That these are not isolated instances will appear from the following extract:

> "And the great Triple power Self-willed who is the third Triple powered, this who becometh in the thirteenth Æon, this who was disobedient, having not emanated all the purgation of his power which (is) in him, nor did he give the purgation of his light at the time when the Rulers gave their purgations in him: wishing to be lord over all the thirteenth Æon with those who become below it."

In fairness to Mr. Horner, however, it should be remembered that paraphrastic translations already exist, and his purpose has been to put the English reader, so far as possible, in the position of the few who can read Coptic.

J. M. Harden.

Christianity and History. By F. W. Butler. S.P.C.K. 5s.

Mr. Butler is not one of those writers who go on saying the same things, in the same words, in one book after another. His book entitled *Can We Dispense with Christianity?* was an important and timely con-

tribution to Christian philosophy, but his latest work excels that, and all his previous books, in grasp and insight, as well as in knowledge. It gives the sensitive reader the feeling that it comes red-hot from the discussion of all that is most characteristic and vital in modern philosophy. It is as up-to-date as this morning's newspaper. Mr. Butler is aware of what are the urgent problems of the most thoughtful modern theology, and he knows just how to use the agreements of modern philosophers—agreements which are deeper and more important than appears on the surface, although they must not be exaggerated—to throw light on the needs of present-day apologetics. The "autonomy of the sciences," for example, is a very important principle for every religious thinker to understand, for it means the definite breakdown, after three centuries of determined trial, of the Cartesian attempt to interpret the universe in mechanical terms. And the philosophical principle of relativity means that history and ethics and theology will play a larger part in the final interpretation of reality than chemistry and mathematics can do. Personality must be central for any adequate philosophy of the universe.

The real contribution of this book, however, comes with Mr. Butler's insistence that spirit, personality, is essentially active. The idea of action must be fundamental and primary for our view of things, especially if that view is to be recognizably Christian, in the historic sense of the word. Christianity is a religion of redemption, of a saving act of God achieved on the plane of history. It conquered its rivals in the Græco-Roman civilization by its proclamation of a God who had really lived, and whose life had made a difference to humanity. To-day the Faith is faced by two great difficulties, and, as always, the way to prestige and effective power is to be found by grappling with those difficulties. They are the difficulties witnessed to by the existence of Naturalism and Modernism.

Naturalism is the worship of process and continuity. It believes in Law. If it has any room for God at all, it is as the meaning of the Whole. "The Laws of Nature are the thoughts of God." It finds miracles frankly incredible. The supernatural is a name for what we do not yet understand, but perhaps it would be wiser not to use a word which is so unpopular in "scientific" circles. Providence is a harmless term, perhaps, to describe the belief that this is the best of all possible worlds, but to pray for fine weather, or for rain, is merely superstitious. God does not interfere with Nature.

Neither, so thoroughgoing Modernism asserts, does He appear on the plane of History. Great ideals draw men's allegiance, and as they yield themselves to them, they are saved, and the world is saved in them and through them. Words like Incarnation and Atonement are valuable as giving symbolical expression to these intuitions of the laws of the spiritual world. But if you insist on the indissoluble connection of the Christian Creed with the alleged historical events mentioned in it, instead of treating these latter as symbols of inner realities, you will place the faith of the simple at the mercy of historical criticism, and wither its confidence by rooting it in uncertainty. For it is obvious that you can never be absolutely certain about any alleged historical fact.

Religion, on this view of it, is a system of ideas, and salvation means standing in a bucket and trying to lift yourself from the ground by lifting the bucket! It is quite certainly, however, not what has been meant in history by Catholic Christianity. Christians have always believed that

God has revealed Himself, and still reveals Himself, in His saving acts. "The action of God brings revelation," Mr. Butler says, "and what He *does* becomes the subject-matter" for our theology. Of course, faith cannot be absolutely certain; it never has been. There is always room for man to *choose*, to give his vote for the Gospel to be true if it can! That is why it is that writing and thinking about Christian origins cannot be and never has been objective and unbiassed and disinterested. As Mr. Butler states it: "The historical record is there, and in it we behold Christ; but He Himself is more accurately discerned in all His historical and abiding meaning, as objective truth, by the one who has spiritual discernment than by the one who either does not possess or will not exercise such discernment. *The objective fact is interpreted within the experience which it creates*, and at no point does it cease to be the object which is thus subjectively appropriated." That is the true relation of Christianity, as a real existence greater than any theory of it can be, to the facts of history.

This book is of special interest to the philosopher as showing the impact of the "neo-idealism" which Croce, Gentile, and others are trying to work out in Italy, on the pressing problems of modern theology. The last chapter on "Action and Revelation" can only be described by the hackneyed word "masterly." There are very few living Christian philosophers whose thought is as fresh and vigorous as Mr. Butler's. He now establishes himself in the front rank of those who, in this generation, serve Christ "with all their mind."

A. E. Baker.

The Heart of the Gospel. By J. K. Mozley, B.D. S.P.C.K. 5s.

Some years ago we were indebted to Mr. Mozley for a short but comprehensive book, *The Doctrine of the Atonement*, covering the Biblical and historical aspects of the doctrine, and adding a single chapter of positive reconstruction. This still remains one of the most valuable guides to the subject available. In general standpoint it was on the whole conservative, stressing the values that underlie the objective transactional theories, though fully recognizing the necessity of subjecting them to drastic criticism. This new book, though complete in itself, may be regarded as a series of appendices to the earlier volume. It consists of a number of articles, addresses, and reviews, but these have been carefully edited and arranged to bring them into a unity, and the result is a book that is both clear and readable.

The opening section gives some positive suggestions towards a doctrine of the Atonement. The middle chapters carry on the review of current literature on the subject down to the present day. The two last chapters are a more general discussion of Christology.

The book is noteworthy for its appreciation of Dr. Forsyth and its criticism of Dr. Rashdall. It is clear throughout that the former writer has exercised a dominating influence upon Mr. Mozley's own thought. He develops Dr. Forsyth's characteristic insistence that the love of God is holy love. This introduces an ethical and rational element into the interpretation, but Mr. Mozley refuses to follow Dr. Rashdall in making this element determinative of his whole system. He moves rather in the direction of Professor Otto's concept of the numinous, "the inspiration of a deep and mysterious reality . . . whose holiness is something more than moral perfection." Such terms as expiation, satisfaction, substitu-

tion, representation, imply the existence of a moral world-order, and "whichever we choose, does there not remain an element of unsolved mystery ?" This is, of course, a typically Anglican position.

We must not expect, then, to find in these essays a completely rounded theory. In fact, Mr. Mozley once or twice (*e.g.*, p. 54 *f.*) seems to deny that any final theory is possible. But it is significant that he lays stress, with the older Western theologies, upon the Cross, for which the modern ethical theories find it so difficult to make a place. Whatever be the truth of the Atonement it is not merely something wrought in us, but once and for ever wrought for us. This is the central point of the older theories, and however defective in detail they may be, they have at least striven to conserve the values which Mr. Mozley sums up as follows:

> "In the Person of the Son God Himself penetrates the life of the world, its suffering, its evil. He holds back nothing. True, He maintains through it all His absolute holiness of being and energy, but He maintains it not aloof from, but at close quarters with, the world's evil. He draws the sting of evil by letting it appear to defeat Him, and thereby gaining an irreversible victory. The Cross is the source of the new moral creation, because in it every moral need is met and satisfied."

This passage invites criticism, especially in its curious assumption that an apparent victory of evil must result in a defeat which is irreversible. But its main standpoint is clear. In Christ the holiness of God, going forth against evil, meets with the response of perfect human holiness. Apparently Mr. Mozley, following Dr. Forsyth, would hold that this avails for us because Christ is our representative. But sometimes a more mystical suggestion is offered.

The whole discussion well deserves careful reading.

It is usually idle to mention misprints in a review, but it was an unexpected joy to find St. Paul preaching to the Ephesian elders from a Westcott and Hort text (p. 53). And surely Bossuet (p. 173) should be Bousset.

L. W. Grensted.

The Problem of Immortality. Studies in Personality and Value. By Radoslav A. Tsanoff, Ph.D. George Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

The great book on the problem of immortality in the light of modern thought is yet to be written. Meantime there is a steadily growing literature on the subject; books of various kinds dealing with one or other aspect of the problem. Dr. Tsanoff has added one more to the list, and his book is an important contribution. In some four hundred odd pages he has managed to range over a very wide field in an attempt to examine some of the more significant theories of human destiny in the history of thought, as related to the theories of human nature on which they are based. Dr. Tsanoff's chapters reveal him as a widely read student in philosophy and theology, and although much in his work is not new to students of the subject, yet his handling of a difficult theme is judicious and stimulating. We would direct attention especially to his treatment of the problem of immortality in modern theology; his survey of the destiny of the soul in recent British Idealism; and the closing chapter on Value, Personality, and Destiny.

We may add a word of congratulation to the publishers for the production of so solid a piece of work at such a reasonable price.

H. Maurice Relton.

INDEX OF VOLUME X

JANUARY—JUNE, 1925

PAGE

Attributes of God, The 247
Authority of Personal Religious Experience 8
Baker, A. E. 71, 196
Baverstock, A. H. 107
Beaufort Moss, C. 265
Berkley William Randolph 275
Bishop Weston of Zanzibar 149
Books Reviewed:
Anglican Church Principles. By F. J. Foakes-Jackson 239
Apostle John, The. By W. H. Griffith Thomas 169
Art of Contemplation. By Ramon Lull (trans. E. A. Peers) 295
Challenge of Life, The. By L. P. Jacks 60
Children of the Sun. By W. J. Perry 292
Christian Beginnings. By F. C. Burkitt 114
Christian Citizenship. By Ed. Shillito 168
Christian Sociology, Studies in. By G. C. Benyon 168
Christus Veritas. By Bishop Temple 61
Church of England, The. By Bishop Headlam 66
Church of England Handbooks 170
Cloud of Unknowing, The 177
1 Corinthians. By E. F. Brown 173
Du Bose as a Prophet of Unity. By J. O. F. Murray 56
Early Christian History, Essays in. By E. T. Merrill 48
Ecce Deus. By H. L. Dixon 57
Epistle to the Hebrews. By Dr. Moffatt 347
Ethical Teaching of Jesus. By E. P. Scott 168
Evolution and the Supernatural. By W. H. Griffith Thomas . . . 170
Four Gospels, The. B. H. Streeter 217
Heathen Contact with Christianity. By — Haines 66
Idealism as a Philosophical Doctrine. By R. F. A. Hoernlé . . . 116
Introduction to the Devout Life. By Francis de Sales 177
Introduction to Lessons of Lectionary. By Dean Furneaux . . . 63
Jesus and the Greeks. By W. Fairweather 174
Love Songs of Sion 55
Master and His Boys, The. By S. S. Harris 297
Mediæval Devotion. By P. Pourrat 209
Message about the Cross, The. By C. J. Cadoux 56
Modern Churchman, The, September, 1924 50
Modern Use of the Bible, The. By H. E. Fosdick 165
Moral Theology, A Handbook of. By A. Koch 53
Nature of a Cathedral, The. F. S. M. Bennett 179
Old Testament, Introduction to. By E. Sellin 58
Old Testament, New Translation. By J. Moffatt 64
Papers in Modern Churchmanship 170
Philosophy of Religion, The. By D. Miall-Edwards 175
Problems of Belief. By F. C. S. Schiller 175
Psychology of Religion, The. By W. B. Selbie 50
Place of Reason in Christian Apologetic, The. By L. Hodgson . . . 234
Quæ de Beata Maria Virgine 177
Religious Experience. By R. H. Fisher 50
Vocabulary of the Greek Testament 178
Brief Notices 60, 117, 180, 298
Brooke, A. E. 114
Clarke, W. K. L. 38, 83, 133, 278
Confession to Laymen 83, 133
Constantine and the Empire 302
Correspondence 35, 107
Council of Nicea, The 308
De Rerum Natura, (1925) 71, 196

PAGE
Dynamic of the Incarnation, The 328
Editorial 1, 61, 121, 181, 241, 301
Effects of Disestablishment in Ireland, The 265
Faith of the Incarnation, The 338
GIBRALTAR, Bishop of 122, 182
GOODALL, C. E. G. 162
Gospel of Life, The 68, 186
HARRIS, C. 319
HENDERSON, R. A. 126
HODSON, C. E. 50
HOOD, F. 165
Ideals of Church Authority, Some 24
JAMES, E. O. 292
JEREMY TAYLOR 257
KIRK, K. E. 53
Liberal Evangelicalism 97
LIETZMAN, DR. HARRIS 40
MARSHALL, H. S. 257
MAYNARD, J. A. 207
Miscellanea 35, 106, 160, 275, 343
Nicene Creed in Action, The 333
Odes of Solomon, The 49
OLLARD, S. L. 275
Orthodox Churches, The 122, 182
Paradise 141
PERSHORE, Abbot of 295
PRESTIGE, L. 141
PRETORIA, Bishop of, Challenge 1
PRIDEAUX, S. P. T. 46
Religious Objections to Betting 162
RICHMOND, W. 68, 186
RIGG, W. H. 97
ROBERTSON, Bishop 308
ROBINSON, J. ARMITAGE 48
Russellism 207
SELWYN, E. G. 1, 60, 249, 338
SPARROW SIMPSON, W. J. 149, 288
SPENS, W. 11
Spiritual Heading 90
Studies in Texts 38, 112, 160
Synoptic Gospels, Recent Literature on the 278
TAYLOR, A. E. 234
Theology and Religious Experience 18
THORNTON, L. S. 247
TURNER, C. E. 41
TURNER, C. H. 217
UNDERHILL, EVELYN 8
Washing of the Feet 126
Western Canada, Church Life in 41
What the First Christians Believed 319
WHITNEY, J. P. 302
WIGHT, M. 90
WINNINGTON-INGRAM, Bishop 333

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER